THE MADRAS
Christian College Magazine

Quarterly Series, Vol. III. APRIL 1923 No. 2

Psychology—Philosophy or Science?

By A. S. Woodburne, M.A., Ph. D.

Psychology is that discipline which undertakes a systematic investigation of the mental processes. It inquires into the genesis and function of such facts as perceiving, conceiving, imagining, remembering, forgetting, judging, reasoning, feeling, attending, choosing, acting, and so on. It recognises that there are both physical and psychical factors in the lives of those persons who think and feel and act. It must take cognizance also of the fact that these various processes function as responses to stimuli, and that both the stimuli and responses are many times in relation to environmental factors. Even a superficial perusal of the subjects in which the psychologist is interested will disclose, the fact that many of them are the same which concern the metaphysician, the logician and the epistemologist, whereas still others are common ground with the physiologist, the biologist, the anthropologist, and the physicist. It is a legitimate question to ask, therefore, whether psychology is a philosophical discipline or a science.

I

It will throw light on our problem to consider a few facts in connection with the historical development of psychology. It has sometimes been asserted that psychology began with Aristotle. At other times its beginnings have been pushed back to Pythagoras. But, though these men marked definite forward steps, we do better to think of its origin as much earlier, whereas its articulation as a discipline in its own right was gradual.

For the beginnings of the stuff out of which psychology was made we must go back to primitivity. The crude animistic conceptions which characterized the earlier stages of human culture were in their own way

recognitions of mental stuff as something distinctive and distinguishable. It need not delay us to dwell upon the details connected with such notions as the breath-soul, the shadow-soul, and the dream-soul. It will suffice to mention that such phenomena as seeing the breath on a cold day, the ceasing of the breath at death, sleep, dreams, and shadows led primitive man to think of the existence of a soul as something apart from the body. The fact that the words 'soul' or 'mind' and 'breath' are identical in so many languages is an interesting bit of evidence in regard to the genesis of the concept. Having once posited the existence of a soul, primitive man engaged in many weird speculations in regard to its nature and functions. The various occultisms, mysticisms and spiritisms that formed these primitive prototypes of psychology were marked by magical and other pre-scientific notions. Various theories were propounded as to the real nature of man, some saying that he is an 'animated body'; others 'warm air'; others 'astral presences'; others 'indivisible atoms'; others 'ghosts in migration'; others 'the seeds of things'; others 'fallen gods'; still others 'pure spirit'; and so on. This early period is sometimes known as the age of psychosophy, or pre-psychology.

The earliest Greek thinkers were called materialists or hylozoists because they did not separate the conscious principle from matter. They were followed by the early dualists. Anaxagoras, for example, was the first to give the names intelligence or spirit (Noûs) to the initial principle in contradistinction from matter. The Sophists were of much more significance to the development of psychology than metaphysics, because they turned man's attention in on himself. In making man 'the measure of all things,' Protagoras substituted empirical knowledge for dogmatic apriorism, although he fell into the difficulty of being too subjective. But we see in the Sophists the psychological dualism between the subjective and objective taking form, a dualism which became even sharper in Socrates. Socrates devised a conceptualistic epistemology which Plato elevated into a system of metaphysics. His 'world of ideas' was a world outside of temporal and spatial relations in which abode thoughts, whereas his world of experience was a world in which things existed merely as copies or shadows of their ideational prototypes. Thus the soul of a concrete individual was described as a copy of the idea-soul which was in that metaphysical order. In that way he treated psychological material under the general head of 'physics,' that is, as belonging to the shadow-world.

Plato plunged philosophy into absolute idealism. Aristotle endeavoured to rescue it by emphasizing the element of experience. He was greatly devoted to scientific interests, as will be seen in the impetus which he gave to empirical science, an impetus in which psychology had a real share. In his general psycho-physical conceptions Aristotle was remarkably modern, though of course he did not have the technique for correct detailed knowledge. The merit of it was that he attained it by an inductive process,

though it suffered from a lack of method for a fuller observation of the neurological functions. But, though Aristotle made use of the empirical method in some phases of his psychological thinking, he was unable to free psychology entirely from certain metaphysical inclinations. He made an attempt to overcome the dualism of the Platonic scheme by locating his universals *in rebus* instead of *ante res.* But he devised another type of dualism in his metaphysics of causality—the duality of form and matter. Moreover Aristotle followed Plato in including psychology under physics, the subject-matter of which was the phenomenal world. Although the great Greek thinker made a tremendous advance both in the fulness of his treatment and in the systematization of his data, still he did not quite free it from his metaphysical presuppositions.

The Patristic and Scholastic periods witnessed no great advance in the development of psychology. The greatest psychologist among the Patristics was St. Augustine (354-430), and he followed the lead of Aristotle. He offered an apologetic for psychology as dealing with the inner world of the mind in distinction from physical nature. Moreover his theological (a particular case of the metaphysical) interest led him to mark the dualism of soul and body, thus anticipating the Cartesian doctrine. Besides this he introduced a new phase of dualism by distinguishing the subjective and objective in thought.

The Scholastics made no important contribution to psychological development. Their interest was metaphysico-theological. The reflections of these mediaeval thinkers centered about the controversy over universals, in the earlier period the Platonic doctrine under the name of 'realism' predominating, and in the later period the Aristotelian doctrine under the name of 'conceptualism' coming to the fore. The theological interest was responsible for the emphasis placed on creationism according to which matter was said to be made out of nothing, and soul the 'breath of God.' It should also be observed that the authority method was regnant. There could be no truth outside of the Church whether in matters of theology, psychology, or anything else. Obviously that mitigated against psychological as well as every other kind of development in thought.

The father of modern philosophy—Descartes—owed more to Augustine than to any of those who preceded him, in so far as his psychological theory is concerned. He adopted the dualism of the Church Father, a dualism of extended substances and cogitative substances. The essence of the body is extension, according to him, and the essence of the mind is thought. Mathematics is the science best adapted to deal with extended substances, whereas psychology must use a different method, namely introspection, in dealing with the facts of mind. It was in this respect that Descartes offered a justification of the method of inner observation as applied to the events of consciousness that his contribution to psychology is important. The peculiar element in the Cartesian position was that his dualism of body and mind was ontological. It was treated not simply as a

practical distinction between two characteristic types of facts, but as a formula of reality, an *apriori* hypothesis at the basis of all philosophy and science.

Associationism was an important movement in the history of psychology, and yet it was not simply a psychological movement. Stated briefly, the law of association asserts that ideas which have occurred together tend to recur together. So long as this is stated in the form of a tendency, there can be no serious objection to it, as descriptive of the habit-forming tendencies in the thought processes. The difficulty arises when these tendencies become raised to the level of laws of the activity of the mind, which the mind is bound to observe. Among the associationists may be mentioned Thomas Hobbes, David Hume, David Hartley, Sir William Hamilton, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, and Alexander Bain. The analyses effected by the various associationists varied from the simple classification into association by contiguity and association by similarity, to more intricate classifications which included, besides these two types, associations by contract, cause and effect, and so on. The logic of the theory involves the idea that all new mental products owe their genesis to the combination of pre-existing elements. At times associationism has been even ultra-ontological, as in the Mind-Dust and Mind-Stuff theories which proposed that mental states were composite, due to the correlation of smaller states. Small particles of atoms (or dust) of mind were believed to be present everywhere in nature as the concomitants of material atoms, and these mental atoms were regarded as constituting the stuff of consciousness. Thus associationism indicates the continued tendency for metaphysics to dominate psychology.

The faculty-psychology was another phase in the history of that discipline which showed certain metaphysical tendencies also. Even as early as the Greeks—Plato and Aristotle—the soul was divided into parts. And Aquinas distinguished 'the *lumen supernaturale* which was to receive the unchangeable concept or essence of an object from the *lumen naturale* which was to conceive the nature of a species by sense presentations, regardless of individual characteristics.'[1] The faculty concept was utilized again by Leibniz and by Wolff, the latter developing it so as to include the faculties of knowledge, of activity or will, and of imagination. Immanuel Kant was a thorough-going exponent of the faculty-psychology, and gave us our familiar terminology—the faculties of thought, feeling and will. Lotze was the most consistent and logical of all the faculty men, and in him we see the ridiculous lengths to which such a theory can go, for he made it possible to have faculties for colour-perception, piano-playing, and every sort of distinguishable mental process. Now the faculty psychology, like associationism, was too rationalistic and structural. It failed to take full account of the fundamental unity and fluidity of the processes of consciousness. It treated the

[1] Dessoir, *Outline of the History of Psychology*, page 65.

human mind as capable of divisions and sub-divisions, much as the metaphysicians treated space. While there is no denying the usefulness of the classification of mental facts achieved, yet the movement was bound to be amended as the students of mental processes freed themselves from metaphysical presuppositions.

A great step forward was taken by the English philosophers, Locke, Berkeley and Hume, in their critiques of the concepts of substance and causality. These were the two fundamental concepts with which modern philosophy uncritically started. Locke attempted a treatment of the actual psychological origin of our ideas without metaphysical assumptions. His position was much akin to the old nominalistic position—a universal is a name, given after the observation and classification of particulars. He retained, however, the concept of substance as the unknown bearer of perceived properties. Berkeley questioned Locke's right to assume the existence of this unknown bearer. According to him substance was a scholastic fiction. So he substituted a complex of ideas for substance. 'To be is to be perceived.' Thus he proposed to cut out non-cogitative substances, though he still retained cogitative substances. It remained for Hume to complete the work begun by Locke and Berkeley. He made use of the principle of sensualism to complete the dissolution of the substance concept. Substance from being a metaphysical unity becomes an active combination of sensations. He then went on to offer his criticism of the concept of causality, which was made on the basis of the principle of the association of ideas. He believed that the causal connection which is posited between events is not a necessary connection which we intuitively recognise, neither is it perceived or experienced. It is added to perception, construed into it, after we have successively observed events in connection. Thus it is based on feeling, is a product of the imagination, and has a purely subjective reference. Perception can only give us *post hoc* It is only by imagination that we conclude, *ergo propter hoc*. This was a bold attack. It involved not simply an attempt of psychology to free itself from metaphysical shackles, but even to dethrone that potentate in his own realm by destroying two of his most precious weapons, substance and causality.

The introduction of the evolutionary hypothesis marked an advance in human thinking with which psychology had to reckon. Lamarck, Darwin and Wallace all recognized psychological elements in the process. Darwin was especially interested in the problems of instinct, emotion, etc., which he discussed from the viewpoint of the theory of natural selection. Moreover the evolutionary hypothesis, through its interest in lower forms of life than the human, involved an interest in animal or comparative psychology. Herbert Spencer was one of the first philosophers to make a systematic application of the evolutionary theory to philosophical problems, including psychology. Spencer made explicit what was implicit in Darwin, viz., that the native forms of the mind are due to solidified social experience, transmitted through heredity. Thus he applied the genetic method to the problems of certain

mental states, finding the genesis in racial experience. So the doctrine of evolution is directly responsible for the introduction into psychology of the genetic method, of comparitive psychology, and of an interest in the problem of reflexive and instinctive behaviour.

One of the foremost of modern psychologists was William James, and from the time of his rise to fame in that field, America has continued to make a distinctive and important contribution to our discipline. James led a revolt of psychology against any domination from metaphysics, and substituted a practial or pragmatic method of dealing with human problems for older idealistic and realistic schemes. This revolt was made as thorough as it seemed possible for the time. James believed that he was completely emancipating psychology and making it a science, and undoubtedly his success in that direction was large, though our behaviouristic friends insist that even consciousness is a relic of metaphysics with which they would like to dispense.

The modern tendency in psychology is towards specialization along different lines. One of these has already been mentioned—comparative psychology which deals with mental processes in animals and men, believing that the observation of animal behaviour can throw much light on the human. Another field of specialized study is child study. This is an intensive study of the early period of the life of the individual with special reference to the genetic problems of adult mental processes, and to educational problems. Social psychology concerns itself with the mental life of men in groups, as groups, and as determinants of the individual's behaviour. Physiological psychology studies the relationship between neural processes and mental processes, and, though it goes back to the Arabians in its origin, it has achieved its most notable advance in recent years. Experimental psychology is more interested in the relation of psychology to physics and chemistry than to physiology. It tries to study special cases of the relation between stimulus and response in order to attain certain quantitative conclusions. It is to this specialized study more than to any other that we owe the present tendency for psychology to find reactions in the form of responses to stimuli as its primary data.

II

This brief enumeration of some of the outstanding historical phases of psychological development is designed to illustrate an evolution of method. The gradual development has been in the general direction away from metaphysical domination towards scientific freedom. To commence with, psychology was a phase of the general philosophical method of explaining the ultimate character of the universe with special reference to the mental portion of it; latterly it has become increasingly a specialized discipline, concerning itself with particular problems. It has left its old home in the academy, and taken up its new abode in the laboratory. It has passed from a static to a

dynamic study, concerning itself with mental processes rather than with states of consciousness. It has ceased to treat its data as structures to be dissected, and adopted the method of regarding them as functions to be observed. Its concern is no longer with a metaphysical soul, or even with *res cogitantes*, but rather with a living, acting psycho-physical organism.

The direction of psychological evolution is well illustrated by the development of the definition. There are four well-marked stages to be observed. The first definition was that of Aristotle. According to him, psychology is 'the science of the soul.' This definition was in practically undisputed sway for two thousand years, and was satisfactory for an age in which theological or ecclesiastical authority was acknowledged over all departments of life. But with the rationalizing and secularizing movement which characterized the beginnings of the modern period the definition was shifted from the Aristotelian formula to the Cartesian: psychology is 'the science of the mind.' The advantage of this change was that it permitted of a more natural method of dealing with mental facts. But it shared with the previous one the tendency to regard the mind (or soul) as a structure—a substance to be observed and described. A good many modern writers, like James and Angell, have preferred to think of psychology as 'the science of consciousness' because that seemed to express the fluid character of the mental portion of the self better than the preceding definitions. Certainly that it is a desideratum that cannot be overlooked. But others, like Watson and McDougall still object that the word 'consciousness' has too many ontological associations to be satisfactory. Moreover other lines of advance such as comparative psychology and psycho-analysis are making it clear that there are other processes and behaviour—reflexive, instinctive, and subconscious—which are very important for a study of mental facts, but which would fall outside the scope of that definition. So they propose that we define psychology as 'the science of behaviour.' Woodworth recognises that this change is advantageous, but still maintains that the centre of interest in our study is the conscious self, the study of the other processes being with a view to obtaining what help we may from them for a better understanding of the conscious processes. So he proposes the definition: 'psychology is the science of the conscious and near-conscious activities of living individuals.' My aim just now is not the achievement of a definition, but to indicate the development which the definitions mark. Soul—mind—consciousness—behaviour—these words surely point to the tendency away from metaphysics towards empirical science.

The traditional analysis of philosophy was one which divided it into metaphysics, epistemology, logic, psychology, ethics and aesthetics. There never has been a time when psychology was in danger from tendencies of ethics and aesthetics to trespass. These sciences have fairly distinct territories to explore and describe. There is more of kinship with metaphysics, epistemology, and logic in respect to a community feeling regarding certain problems. In the past it has frequently been quite impossible for

psychology to achieve any independent treatment of many problems because its right was disputed by these other mental disciplines. It has remained for an age of specialization to give psychology its opportunity. Nowadays nobody pretends to be metaphysician, logician and psychologist all at once, and those who are devoted to the psychological phases of problems are less likely to be hampered by other interests and theories, dictated by the sister disciplines.

Reference has already been made to the associationist movement, and it was pointed out in that connection that associationism offered an unsatisfactory account of mental processes because of its ontological and structural tendencies. The stricter of the associationists accounted for the mental processes by a rigidly structural association of ideas in accordance with definite laws. But one by one these laws suffered reduction or dissolution until they all disappeared. And to-day we account for association not by fixed laws, but by fluid tendencies or processes. The change in the terminology is significant as psychology has achieved the right of self-determination, unfettered by ontological presuppositions.

The problem of the relation of body and mind is one of the oldest philosophical problems, and the solutions that have been suggested are many, including several types each of dualism and monism, sometimes the emphasis being on the physical and again on the psychical side of the relationship. Mysticism has sometimes assumed a dualistic outlook, and decried the body, and at other times it has preached a monistic doctrine with the stress on the spiritual element. In the past psychology has been distinctly under the control of metaphysics and epistemology in the treatment of this problem. But to-day metaphysics is learning from psychology that we are not souls with bodies, neither bodies with souls, but psycho-physical organisms characterized by unity and continuity. If we never separated the body and soul in our thinking, we would not have the theoretical problem of trying to get them together again. Thus the old theoretical dualism has given place to a practical monism, centering about the unity of our lives.

The theory of relativity has awakened a new interest in the ancient problems of space and time. Even a sketch of the history of the metaphysics of space and time would take us far afield. It will suffice to point out the vexed nature of the problems. Until recently it has been generally assumed that these were distinct problems, and space was regarded as three-dimensional. But the new geometry and astronomy have established a four-dimensional space-time continuum in regard to which our knowledge is not absolute but relative. Relativity may be a new conception for the metaphysician and the epistemologist, but not so for the psychologist. For he knows that it is not possible to perceive either space or time as such. What one perceives are objects, and he perceives them in particular spatial or temporal relations, such as high or low, near or far, right or left, up or down, sooner or later, completed or incompleted. Obviously these

psychological facts are of much more practical interest and value, though they may not be concerned with *apriori* forms or faculties.

Psychology and logic are both concerned with the thinking processes. The distinction is sometimes made that logic is a normative science whereas psychology is only descriptive. Logic deals with thought from the viewpoint of the correctness or otherwise of its processes. Psychology finds the incorrect equally interesting to the correct. Dewey is inclined to dispute this distinction, and to suggest that when psychology gives a complete account of the thought processes it will have to deal with the matter of conformity to norms also, and thus that is may eventually make logic unnecessary. Be that as it may, we may observe quite distinct treatments of the concept, the judgment, and reasoning by these two disciplines. The chief concern of psychology is with them, not as serving functions in certain normative processes, but as tools of thinking. To be sure the influence of this psychological point of view is being felt strongly in logical circles, but that is all the more reason for emphasizing it in this connection as indicative of the present day tendency toward scientific freedom in psychology, and, through psychology, to allied fields.

The treatment of intelligence is a noteworthy example of the shift of emphasis. Anaxagoras was the first to write of an intelligence (*Noûs*) as a vital or formative principle in distinction from matter. Protagoras spoke of intelligence, along with reason and desire, as one of the parts of the soul, thus using the same word for the human faculty as Anaxagoras used for the cosmos. Plato located the intelligence of Anaxagoras in his world of ideas, a rational principle. Aristotle put intelligence at the apex of his conceptualist pyramid, and as Weber says, he apotheosised it. At the same time he gave it a place in his psychological analysis as the active reason, the highest function of human thought. The mediaeval philosophy preserved this Aristotelian dualism, as has already been pointed out, in the *lumen supernaturale* and *lumen naturale*. Descartes accepted uncritically the concept of a thinking substance, and it was only with the English philosophers that a beginning was made in freeing intelligence from ontological considerations. Modern investigators with their tendencies toward specialisation and mathematical precision begin from an observation of human behaviour, and try to discover what the precise elements are which enter into intelligent behaviour. It is significant that they seldom use the words intelligence, consciousness, instinct, and reflex because these substantives smack too much of ontological entities, but they prefer the adjectival forms as descriptive of tendencies or types of behaviour. The greatest achievement of modern individual psychology is the working out of a technique of measurement for the quantitative determination of ability to make intelligent responses to concrete situations. Now the intelligence test has been useful, not only as a device for measurement, but as a method of determining what are the characteristics of intelligent behaviour. Terman, on the basis of his extended investigations analyses it into three factors: (1) the tendency to take and maintain a definite direction; (2) the capacity to make adaptations

with reference to a desired end; and (3) the power of auto-criticism. It is of interest to observe that the generality of opinion is that there is no such thing as general intelligence, but that the mass of experimental results leads to the conclusion that abilities are particular or specific, and that what makes one person's behaviour intelligent may be quite a different assembly of abilities to those which may be combined in the intelligent behaviour of another. Certainly it is a far cry from the *Noûs* of Anaxagoras to the intelligence test of Binet, and the modern development is a great testimony to the fact that psychology is becoming an exact science to be satisfied with no goal short of the exactitude of mathematics.

Since the days of Weber and Fechner we have been familiar with the attempts of the psychologist to apply the technique of measurement to sensations. It is in large measure a result of the development of that tendency that we are learning that 'sensation' is a dangerous word, and we speak now of the perception of sensory qualities, and measure them. But the process has been vastly extended, and we measure not only reaction-time, but, as already indicated, all sorts of specific abilities. And the application of the measuring process is being extended and applied to volition, emotion, and even traits of character. Although no one claims finality for the achievements so far obtained, certainly they have gone far enough to allay any suspicion that the present tendency is a fad or a passing phase. The study of mental processes and abilities can never again pass into the hands of the theorist, since it has been so clearly demonstrated that the methods of exact science are so fruitful.

The typical characteristic of modern psychological procedure is its use of the experimental method. In that sense it is rapidly becoming, if it has not already become, a thoroughly inductive science. It is content to get along without any aprioris whatsoever. It wants to find out what the facts are in regard to mental processes, without assumptions and without prejudices. The greater Universities in the West have recognized this fact, and made Psychology a separate department, as Philosophy or Physics or Chemistry are. It is a question whether it does not find more in common with the biological and physical sciences to-day, than with its older associates—metaphysics, logic and the theory of knowledge. At the same time it needs to be repeatedly emphasized that psychology is interested in the unity of the processes, and has not committed itself to a substitution of physiological hypotheses for psychological ones, or to any other assumption as some of its critics have suggested. In the broad sense that philosophy is a science of sciences and that it is concerned with mental facts and their interpretation, psychology may be said to be a philosophical discipline, and certainly the other philosophical disciplines cannot afford to neglect the data which it assembles in regard to such processes. On the other hand, psychology aims at exactness through the use of strictly mechanical methods, so that it can claim every right to be called a science. It is possible that its adoption of the scientific attitude and technique may have a wholesome influence on the whole field of philosophy.

The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Mr. H. G. Wells

By the Rev. T. S. Taylor, M.A., B. Litt., Manchester.

The development of the theological opinions of Mr. H. G. Wells, which seems to have culminated, at least for the moment, in his book entitled, *The Undying Fire*, is a subject of more than passing interest. It is a sign and a portent, which all who have the slightest concern for the religious thought of their fellows will do well to examine with careful and sympathetic attention.

Mr. Wells may be an amateur in theology, but he is a professional observer of life, and this should certainly be accounted unto him for righteousness. No writer since Charles Dickens died has appealed to such varied types of readers; and the reason for it is, that he lays bare with an uncanny power of perception the inarticulate hopes and fears which this changing time awakens in our inmost hearts.

This most modern of the prophets can best be described as a rebel from the orthodoxy of science; for he clearly sees that the greatest and most pressing need of our time is for mankind to escape from the whirlpool produced by modern mechanical inventions. And the way of escape he suggests is the discovery of some kind of spiritual faith, that will give man control over the machinery which the wizardry of science has called into existence, and which for lack of intelligent and coherent guidance threatens civilisation with final ruin.

For himself he professes to have found such a faith; and we have it on the authority of so eminent a theologian as Dr. Inge, that the ideas set forth in his latest complete work are scarcely to be distinguished from those that are generally accepted as Catholic. It seems to me therefore that the way in which Mr. Wells has travelled to this belief is a subject which should be of interest even to theologians; since it can be taken as symptomatic of the development of ideas in the mind of a large section of the general public.

Far be it from me to suggest that the theologians have anything to learn from Mr. Wells about theology. I should have to live in hiding for the rest of my life if I did that. But I do most certainly believe that even the theologians can learn a very great deal from this writer about the attitude towards religious things of quite large numbers of ordinary people.

We are so much accustomed to-day to ascribe all changes either social or spiritual to the effect of the War, that it is lightly assumed by many that the turning of Mr. Wells towards religion is one more miracle to be ascribed to that moral and spiritual impetus, which is believed to be the outcome of

the spectacle of wholesale slaughter. It is therefore necessary to show, that Mr. Wells has always been intensely interested in the subject of religious faith. And although there can be no doubt that the suffering caused by the War has accelerated the speed of his theological development, it has continued quite consistently on lines already clearly laid down.

As far back as the year 1907 he published a book which was a serious exposition of the faith held by him at that time. It is interesting, though perhaps not particularly tactful, to recall that it was in this same year, that the Rev. R. J. Campbell brought out that much discussed summary of his preaching entitled *The New Theology*; and Mr. Wells in his own confessions, which he calls *First and Last Things*, shows a certain consciousness of Mr. Campbell's existence.

The great point of *First and Last Things* is, that faith is a matter of choice; and the author chooses to believe that the universe has a meaning, for which everything in it, and everything that happens in it, possesses significance. But though he thus commits himself to the idea of a scheme, he simply refuses to admit that this implies a schemer. He slides out of this by saying that he only uses such words as *scheme*, *importance*, or *significance* in a spirit of allegory because he can find no better words, and that he therefore will not allow himself to be entangled by any insistence on their implications. At the same time he seems to believe in a sort of communion between himself and a something not-himself. He puts it in this way :—'It is perhaps poverty of mind and language that obliges me to say that then this universal scheme takes on the aspect of a sympathetic person and my communion a quality of fearless worship. These moments happen, and they are the supreme fact in my religious life to me, they are the crown of my religious experience.'

For a moment or two he seems attracted by the similarity between this view and the Christian conception of the relationship of the individual to a mystical being at once human and divine, the Risen Christ. But then as though he becomes aware of a clerical arm extended ready to hale him off to a pew in the parish church, he suddenly shies off, just as earlier he beat a hasty retreat from any confession of belief in God. He adds quite inconsequently that Christ has never attracted him.

Neverthless he states that the scheme has an aspect towards himself which he can perceive, and which he finds imperative. To perceive this aspect to the utmost of his power, and to shape his acts according to that perception is his idea of salvation. And his decision for himself is that the general business of life is the development of a collective consciousness and will and purpose out of the chaos of individual consciousnesses and wills and purposes.

In *New Worlds for Old*, published in 1908, he takes this same ground and works out its practical application in a very persuasive and enticing description of Fabian Socialism. In this book he shows his complete

disagreement with the mechanical view of history as put forward by Karl Marx. At the same time he does not at all hold with the view which would make history a chaotic and aimless conflict of individuals. He feels that there is something going on, that is constantly working to bring order out of chaos. For convenience he calls this Good Will, and he says: 'This Good Will of our race, however arising, however trivial, however subordinated to individual ends, however comically inadequate a thing it may be in this individual case or that, is in the aggregate an operating will.'

In the year 1909 he applies these views to his work as a novelist in *Tono Bungay*. This is the first of those novels in which what has come to be regarded as the characteristic style of Mr. Wells is fully exhibited. It is a dissection of the modern world by one who desires to put some meaning into it and in many ways it is the ablest book he has ever written. He does seem to reveal in it his own inner attitude towards his work. He wants to express what Life means, and leaving the field of generalization, he seeks to get at this meaning by describing as clearly as he can his own experience. This seems to him to be worth doing since he has seen life from so many different angles, having occupied successively so many of the social strata which so clearly mark the various classes into which the English race naturally falls.

He seeks to describe a changing England, an England dominated once by ideas, which for convenience are described as feudal, but in which life apparently had some meaning, gradually being converted into the modern manufacturing England where the exploiter is king, and wherein life has apparently no meaning. He sees it as a spectacle of forces running to waste. It affects him almost like physical pain that there is no plan behind it all, no theory of life, no ideal towards which things are working. But before he closes there becomes dominant another note, a note which seems the herald of some kind of faith. It comes in the form of an idea that through the confusion *something drives*, 'something that is at once human achievement and the most inhuman of all existing things: something comes out of it. . . .'

At this point the famous Wellsian dots do heavy duty in saving the writer from going any further in an explanation which might awaken hopes in the heart of the vicar of the parish.

In 1910 Mr. Wells published *The New Machiavelli*, which is a very self-revealing book. Here he shows more clearly than ever his break from the neo-Calvinism of nineteenth century science. Evolution has become for him a pompous, question-begging word; evolution may lead anywhere. Speaking in the person of his hero the writer says, that for a long time he has believed that life is a various and splendid disorder of forces that the spirit of man sets itself to tame. Later on he seems to catch a glimmer of something beyond mere human effort in this process. He speaks of a something greater than ourselves, which does not so much exist as seek

existence, palpitating between being and not-being. And at one point in the book it almost seems as though he was prepared to give to this 'something' an even more definite and satisfying existence, even up to the point of thinking of it as a person, akin to the Christian idea of God. But with that suddenness, to which we have grown accustomed, he breaks away from this.

The same tendency of thought is shown towards the end of his book called *Marriage* published in 1912; and here, instead of coming in almost accidentally and then being dropped as in *The New Machiavelli*, it really seems to be an integral part of that solution to the marriage problem, which Mr. Wells apparently has in his mind, but which he never quite discloses.

We come now to Mr. Wells as effected by the war. In 1916 he published another very self-revealing book entitled *Mr. Britling Sees it Through*. But he does not reveal his own attitude. With really delicate perception he has preserved a record of the extraordinary jumble of feelings aroused in the minds of nearly all ordinary people by the sudden coming of the great catastrophe, and the way in which they gradually adjusted themselves to it. And what is of the very greatest importance for my present purpose is the fact that in the end everything is focussed on the theological issue.

The need for some eternal background to the spirit of a man—a need with which he had been preoccupied for nearly ten years as his writings show—evidently became so poignant owing to the sufferings of the War, that it forced from him a far more explicit and definite statement of faith than any he had yet made. By this time Mr. Wells had obviously come to feel that, if the integrity of man's spirit was to be maintained, he must believe in a God whom he could know and love. This brought him face to face with the dilemma propounded by John Stuart Mill, from which he sought to escape by a doctrine of a limited God. At one point he says:—'After all the real God of the Christians is Christ, not God Almighty: a poor mocked and wounded God nailed on a Cross of matter . . . . . Some-day He will triumph . . . .'

Having thus committed himself to a certain positive faith Mr. Wells felt it necessary to develop it further, and to defend it. The next book, published in 1917 and called *God the Invisible King*, is therefore a definite apologia for the author's religious opinions. This is a very different book from *First and Last Things*, and it is very interesting to compare the two. At the same time the author allows us to be under no misapprehensions. He is no penitent returning to the Christian fold. Such an idea he repudiates with scorn. He is almost ferocious in his attack upon parsons, but as I have hinted before, that is his panic-stricken method of preventing their clasping him to their hearts.

A considerable portion of the book consists of destructive comment on the work of the Council of Nicaea; for it is there that the author sees the fatal error of the Christian movement in its identification of the Saviour God with the God who had created the conditions which demanded a Saviour. Whether Mr. Wells' researches into early church history brought him into contact with the work of Marcion or not, I cannot say. But it is interesting to notice that he follows the line which Marcion took in distinguishing between the God of Creation and the God of Salvation.

Mr. Wells begins with a Veiled Being, which is apparently the Unknowable of Herbert Spencer mingled with the Life Force of Bergson. This Being is responsible for the creation of the universe, and consequently for all the ills that flesh is heir to. The writer then proceeds to describe the God of Salvation. He regards him as a person of independent spiritual life, and as finite. How he has originated is not clear, but he is spoken of as having a beginning. At one time it almost seems as though he was conceived of as the product of the highest aspirations and ideals of men like the Good Will of *New Worlds for Old* but there follows an explicit statement that he is not a mere multiple of the minds of men: he lives in their minds but is himself independent of them: he is a person, a leader, a courageous captain, an invisible King. Mr. Wells avoids identifying this person with Jesus Christ, about whom he maintains a certain reserve mingled with a rather grudging tribute, as though he were attracted, but did not care to admit it.

It is obvious that for this faith Mr. Wells has to seek a mystical rather than a rational basis. It is attained not by argument but in the immediacy of personal consciousness. The attempt of the creeds to make faith rational —for oddly enough the creeds were intended to square the faith with a consistent theory of the universe—rouses him to a pitch of fury. And apparently it is with a genuine start of surprise that he suddenly discovers that he has quite a lot in common with the mysticism of St. Paul.

But though he produces no intellectual arguments for belief in the God of his revelation; and though his belief in a universe, not at present rationally based but which may become so, will evoke the dreadful cry of dualism from those who have been carefully brought up; yet there is an eloquence and a warmth of conviction in his own personal testimony to the way in which this faith comes to a man, which must awaken our respect. There are passages in *God the Invisible King* which are as genuine a revelation of true religious experience as any in literature.

It must of course be a matter of pure speculation as to what processes of thought caused the advance of Mr. Wells from this position to that which he takes up in *The Undying Fire.* But somehow or other he evidently discovered that the problem of evil and suffering, which faced him as soon as he dared to express belief in God, had been faced very earnestly by quite a number of theologians in the past. Whether the new apostle was initiated into supra-lapsarian or sub-lapsarian controversies I do not know. But I

darkly suspect him of coming to his present position by way of the devil. I think he must have found out that Christian thought was not coerced into monism by the Council of Nicaea; but that long before that Council there was a theory which accounted for the evil of the world without altogether saddling the Creator with all the responsibility. In short Mr. Wells discovered the fascinating theory of Satan. Now from Satan to the book of Job is a very natural transition, especially if you look up the subject in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.* And so Mr. Wells discovered in what he once spoke of as 'that strange miscellany of Jewish and early Christian literature' a book wherein the very problem which had agitated his mind from *Mr. Britling* onwards, had been sincerely and resolutely faced by someone who had never heard of modern science. No wonder it cast such a spell on him.

In taking the scaffolding of the book of Job as the setting for his treatment of the age-long problem of pain, Mr. Wells has taken the book as it stands. Though evidently aware of the work of Biblical critics, he does not avail himself of it. It does not at all perturb him that many competent scholars see in this book the work of at least three types of mind, or that the speeches of Elihu are regarded as an interpolation and the ending bathos. He follows his model almost down to the last detail, and yet he has so skilfully modernised it, that one is almost tempted to believe that the ancient book of Job was written for the special benefit of our particular time. In his own way he has done something for which the Biblical critics should be grateful though it is doubtful whether they are; he has supplied them with a consistent text.

The prologue shows that Mr. Wells has abandoned the idea of an opposition between the Creator and the Saviour God. For he there accounts for the evil of the world by the slight inexplicable inaccuracy which the devil is allowed to introduce into each move made by the Supreme Being, and which necessitates further moves in correction. The Creator is represented as determining and concealing the aim of the game—the analogy of chess is being used—and it is never clear whether the adversary is to defeat or assist him in his unfathomable subject. The wager between God and Satan is made once again; and the object of the experiment is Job Huss, a modern schoolmaster after Mr. Wells' own heart. It is interesting to notice that just as the biblical Job, whilst rejoicing in the material well-being of his children, was all the time anxious for their spiritual state and sacrificed for them continually, so Job Huss, whilst doing everything possible to make his pupils technically efficient, yet concentrates his main attention on saving their souls, in a Wellsian sense, by giving them a consistent and noble outlook on life. In like manner the comforters, though they are very modern figures, conform with a remarkable exactness to the main lines of the biblical model. There is however one exception; Mr. Wells' Elihu, who represents the modern scientific view of life, is a much more respectable figure than any of the other comforters.

There is not the same disposition to rag him, and in this the original is certainly deserted.

In the debate the comforters first take the line, that the providential government of the world does in the end arrange that the really righteous truly prosper. Job Huss meets this argument with a terrible argument of the natural order, such as is hinted at in *The New Machiavelli*, where Mr. Wells gives his early doubts of evolution. Like his creator, the schoolmaster has never really believed in Providence in the ordinary way that word is used. He has always believed that it is the task of the spirit of man to bring order out of chaos, and that God calls him to this task: but now God seems to have deserted him; and so the horror of the chaos, which he had faced hitherto with a high heart, threatens to overwhelm him.

The defenders of orthodoxy next retreat to their second line, and put forward the idea of immortality as a solution to the problem caused by the apparent impossibility of getting justice done here below. But their orthodoxy is very modern. They do not rely on any of the old-fashioned arguments in defence of heaven. They testify with tears in their eyes to the comfort to be obtained from Sir Oliver Lodge's description of the neat way in which the damaged goods of this world are nicely put together again in the next. This awakens the anger of Job Huss, since he obviously feels with the late George Gissing that it is mere superstition pranking in professor's spectacles. To him the bringing in of the idea of personal immortality seems a cowardly dodging of the problem raised by this strange inexplicable world. Quite in the mood of *First and Last Things* Job Huss feels that if there is a God he must be squared with the dreadful things in the world as well as with the beautiful. The nice ironing away of all the wrinkles in a blessed hereafter seems a deliberate evasion of the difficulty. But all the same he has his own belief in immortality. He says:—'There burns an undying fire in the hearts of men. By that I know the God of my salvation. His will is Truth; His will is Service. He urges me to conflict without consolations, without rewards. He takes and does not restore. He uses up and does not atone. He suffers—perhaps to triumph, and we must suffer, and find our hope of triumph in Him. He will not let me shut my eyes to sorrow, failure or perplexity. Though the Universe torment and slay me, yet will I trust in Him. And if He also must die—nevertheless I can do no more; I must serve Him.' There is a remarkable similarity between the point of view expressed in this section of Mr. Wells' book and that of Dr. Inge's essay entitled *Survival and Immortality*, first published in the *Hibbert Journal* in 1917.

Commemoration Address*

By the Rev. E. M. Macphail, C.B.E., D.D.

'Remember the former things.'

It is good both for individuals and for societies to recall their past, and to remember how they have come to be what they are. During the exile of the Israelites in Mesopotamia their great prophet called upon his fellow exiles to remember the former things so that they might be cheered as they looked into the future, and all through the ages, whether in individual, social, political, or religious life, men have felt impelled to commemorate, usually by annual celebrations, important events in their history. It is therefore a fitting thing that we, the members of a college which always seeks to cherish corporate life, should meet together once in the year for the express purpose of remembering the former things, of giving thanks to God for those who have made the College what it is, and to ask His blessing on its future.

This a suitable time of year at which to commemorate the founding of the institution which was to develop into the Madras Christian College, for it was in the spring that John Anderson landed in Madras and opened the General Assembly's Institution. This day then is first of all a birthday celebration. Such days in youth are days of rejoicing, but as people grow older they take less interest in their birthdays and indeed think that they come round with alarming rapidity. A book I received the other day giving the recollections of people who could say, 'I remember Robert Louis Stevenson', contains an interesting letter from an American lady who when a child had an amusing experience with that great author, which illustrates that attitude. Her father was a friend of Stevenson's and happened to mention to him that his little daughter was much distressed because her birthday fell on Christmas Day, and she was thus deprived of a special celebration of her own. Stevenson, with his charming whimsicality, at once said that he had a birthday which was rather time-worn and for which he had no further use, and drew up a formal deed of gift transferring all his rights to the thirteenth of November to the little American girl 'to have, hold, exercise, and enjoy the same in the customary manner'; and it is pleasant to know that the new birthday was duly celebrated.

But though middle-aged persons may care little about birthdays, as they become older and more venerable we find them and others taking a greater interest in these anniversaries, and even regarding with a certain amount of satisfaction the increasing number of the years that they have

* An address delivered in the Anderson Hall on Commemoration Day, Feb. 7, 1923.

seen. Our college has reached that venerable position. Last Friday February 2, was the eighty-sixth anniversary of the day on which John Anderson landed in Madras, and last December was the sixtieth December since the one in which William Miller began his great work in India. It is fitting therefore that we as a College looking back over these long years should with humility and gratitude give God thanks for all the way that He has led us, and in particular for what He enabled these men and their fellow-workers to do for us who have entered into their labours.

In the eloquent address which Mr. Meston delivered to you last year he described in his own felicitous way the works of our Founders. It is fitting that I, who have been called upon to address you at this our second celebration, and am now a kind of link between the past and the present, should try to recall the names of at least some of those who were the colleagues of Dr. Miller during the arduous years which preceded and immediately followed the establishment of the College on its present basis. Even to me some of them are but names, though their work was remembered well and often spoken of when I joined the College. Such were Dr. Carslaw Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Ross, who died at an early age in Madras and whose memory is recalled by the Ross Prize in Mathematics.

The chief coadjutors of Dr. Miller in the early days were Mr. William Stevenson and Mr., afterwards Dr., Milne Rae. On the reorganization of the College Mr. Stevenson became Secretary of the Free Church Mission and thereafter only occasionally in times of need took part in the teaching work of the College. On his retirement he became Secretary of the Women's Foreign Mission Committee of the Free Church of Scotland and died only a few years ago. It is interesting to know that one of his grandsons is one of the most distinguished undergraduates of Oxford University at the present time. Dr. Milne Rae acted several times as Principal during Dr. Miller's absence, and he too on his retirement became the secretary of one of the Church Committees, an office he held till his death in 1917. Mr. Rangiah Chetty who became Assistant Professor of Mathematics in 1871 and whose tragic death was mourned by all, is well known to us all because of the filial piety of his sons who in his memory presented to the College the Hostel which bears his name. Dr. Charles Cooper, who because of his venerable appearance, his philosophic calm, and his simple and amiable nature was regarded by generations of students as a typical guru, joined the staff in 1874. He retired in 1899, and died in 1910. His long years of service, during which he acted several times as Principal, and first filled the newly created responsible post of Bursar, are commemorated by the Cooper Prize and by the endowment generously presented by his sisters, by means of which some poor but deserving students are assisted in their college course.

And here I would pause for a moment in this biographical record to refer to the great change which transformed the Free Church of Scotland Mission Institution into the Madras Christian College, and which came into operation on January 1, 1877. Three great factors in statesmanship are the power

to see what it is desirable should be done, the power to see what actually can be done, and the power to persuade other people so as to get things done. Dr. Miller possessed all these powers in a wonderful degree. His active mind was never satisfied with what had been achieved when he saw things that needed to be done, and yet at the same time he recognised that things might often, if not usually, have to be done slowly. He had now, with his fellow-workers whom he inspired with his own spirit, wrought a marvellous change in the School which he had found on his arrival, but he felt that the objects at which he and his predecessors alike aimed could be achieved only by a further development. He sought therefore the creation of a stronger, larger and better equipped College by means of the co-operation and the united efforts of all the missionary bodies engaged in educational work in Madras. He obtained the approval and sympathy of all, but in spite of his ardent advocacy, he was only partially successful in obtaining active help. That, however, did not prevent him from making the best of what was possible—working with things, as he used to say, the way they'll work with you--and though for the time being only two other Missionary bodies gave active help in the formation of the united College the College assumed its new name and adopted its new constitution. Now there are no fewer than seven Churches and Societies contributing to the maintenance of this College, and on this occasion we should recall their names. They are the United Free Church of Scotland, the Church Missionary Society, the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, the Church of Scotland, the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, the London Missionary Society, and the Reformed Church of America. We give thanks for the co-operation of these great organisations which makes possible the work of our College, and for the spirit of brotherliness which has made that co-operation possible. But especially ought we to give thanks for the clear insight, the wide views, and the patient work of him whom we rightly regard as the founder of the College in its new form, and we thank God that he has lived to see his ideal carried nearer to a fulfilment.

Some of the members of the original staff of the newly organised College have already been named. The others were Mr. George Patterson, of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, and Mr. Michie Smith who were soon afterwards joined by Mr. Alexander. Mr. Patterson was professor of history and was the editor of the College Magazine when it was started in 1883. He had to retire owing to ill health in 1891, and became Secretary in London of the Christian Literature Society, an office which he still discharges with vigour. Mr. Michie Smith was our first professor of Physics. He retired in 1893 to become Government astronomer, and died in Kodaikanal last September. We have to commemorate him as a benefactor also, for he has shown his affection for the College where he worked so long by leaving it a legacy of a thousand pounds. Owing to bad health Mr. Alexander retired in 1885. After working for many years in important Churches in Dundee and Liverpool, Dr. Alexander, as he now is, has retired from active work.

I would ask you also to remember to-day the names of those members of the Senatus who during the last twenty years have passed to their rest. For nearly thirty years no past or present member of the professoriate had been removed by death, but early in the century in three successive years we lost men whom we could ill spare. Mr. Kellett, who had become professor of History in 1892, died suddenly while on furlough in 1904. A man of brilliant gifts and untiring energy he was beloved by his students, and his memory is still fresh in their minds both because of his ability as a teacher and for his interest in their welfare. It is to him chiefly that the Madras Teachers' Guild owes its existence. Mr. John Mackenzie died in Madras in 1905 when he had been on the staff for six years. He was a man of wonderful originality of mind, and though he had been distinguished as a mathematician he was equally at home in English Literature and Philosophy, the subjects which he preferred to teach. Mr. Stirling who died in 1906 had been professor of Mathematics for two years only. His early death cut short a most promising career. Mr. Craig who died after a short illness in December 1912 had been with us even a shorter time. He joined the staff in July 1911 as the first representative on it of the Church of Scotland, when the English Honours course was instituted. His early death was mourned alike by his students and colleagues. Mr. Morren, who was appointed professor of Mathematics in 1884 and retired after twenty years service in 1904, died suddenly in Aberdeen in 1919. For many years Mr. Morren edited the College Magazine and in his retirement, no less than when in Madras, he was ever a loyal friend of the College and all its activities. Dr. Russell joined the staff in 1887 and retired owing to ill health in 1913. He died suddenly at Edinburgh in 1918. Among the many services he rendered to the College special mention should be made of his work as Bursar. It is largely owing to his untiring and self-sacrificing work that the College owes the existence of its new buildings.

Let us thank God for these men, most of whom gave their lives in the service of the College. They rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.

We have to recall to-day with sorrow the loss of one who was specially remembered last year in the list of our benefactors. Dr. Alexander Miller passed peacefully away in April last at his house in Buckie, the fishing town in Banffshire where he had laboured for nearly fifty years. I have known him all my life as a dear friend. A few of you perhaps remember his visit to us here just thirty years ago. All of you, I trust, know him at least by name as a most generous benefactor of the College by whose gifts many of us are benefitting to-day; and to the end he has been mindful of the College. But I wish you specially to think of him as a man who, endowed with great abilities and possessing ample means, devoted most of his life to ministering to a congregation composed largely of fishermen in a small town in an out-of-the-way part of Scotland. While possessing wide interests and contributing liberally of his wealth, not only to this College but to many

other objects, and while taking an important part in the counsels and administration of the Church, he above all devoted himself to work which many would have regarded as common-place if not unattractive. His life is an example to us to do faithfully the bit of work that falls to our lot to do, however little it may seem to us to be worthy of our ambition or of the abilities we may fancy we possess. For one who has done so much for us, for our close connexion with one who led a simple life devoted to the service of his Master and of his fellow men, we do well to give thanks.

As then as we remember the former things and think of those who have gone before us, of those who have laboured with us and for us, of those who have given freely of their substance of their talents and of their life's work to establish and foster our College, let us seek to emulate them in their devotion to God and to the service of their fellow men. The same prophetic voice which called upon the Israelites of old to remember the former things later on in his message exhorted them to forget the former things. What does this paradox mean? It means that the memory of the past may be a fatal snare if men dwell exclusively upon the thought of past achievements, and make the memory of their glorious past a bar to further advance and a substitute for a glorious present. We who have entered upon the inheritance of the past traditions and achievements of this College have taken upon ourselves a heavy burden of responsibility. To each one of us, teacher and student alike, belongs the duty of handing on to others what we have received not only unimpaired but enhanced. A corporate body, such as this College is, has this advantage over an individual, that like the eagle in the fable it can renew its youth, and that age may add not only to its venerableness but to its strength and vigour. But a corporate body, though more than the sum of the individuals who compose it at any one time, depends for its strength and vigour on the character of those individuals. Forms may remain the same, traditions may be nominally honoured, but if the spirit of those who study and teach within our walls ceases to be like that of those whom we remember this day, our Commemoration may become a meaningless ceremony. But if we preserve the same lofty aims and seek after the same ideal, even though changes may come, the College will be able to meet them all with equanimity and with the confidence that new developments will but prepare the way for higher service. What that ideal is I hardly need repeat again. It is that ideal which Jesus Christ put before His disciples—the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. The world has ever had need of men who are willing to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness and it never needed them more sorely than it does to-day. Our aim in this College is to help the world by trying to produce such men, and for what it has done for India and through India for the world in past days we give God thanks. We look forward into the unknown future with quietness and confidence of heart because we trust in God, and we pray that He may be to us in the days to come, as He has been in the past, our refuge and our strength.

Ancient Tamil Society as Depicted in the Purananuru

By R. Rangachariar, M.A., L.T.

Readers of Tamil Literature know that *Purananuru*, a collection of four hundred verses, forms one of the eight compilations of the time of the third or the last Madura Tamil Sangam. The name of the author of this anthology has not been preserved to us, nor the name of the king or chief under whose auspices the work was compiled. The verses forming the collection were not the production of one poet or of one age, but of poets who flourished before and during the last Tamil Sangam. These poets were not confined to any particular class or sex, and comprised Brahmans, Vellalas, and kings, with a fair proportion of women.

The poems were, in the majority of cases, of a complimentary kind, composed in honour of benevolent patrons in commemoration of their victories; others were composed in moments of extreme depression, brought about by pinching poverty, morbid jealousy, or the wounded pride of the poet. They sang in a lucid and felicitous style of their patrons and heroes, their ancestry, prowess, benefactions, kindness, friendship and other qualities which made the Tamil sovereigns famous. The three great potentates, the Pandyas, the Cheras and the Cholas, shared among them a good many of these laudatory poems. Besides these three principal sovereigns there were minor kings and chiefs who surpassed the former in their patronage of letters. Many poets heaped upon them unstinted praise in glowing language, and made them as famous and illustrious as the other three. For instance the illustrious benefactor and patron, Pāri, won such a great name for his gifts that the three sovereigns mentioned above became jealous, and they compassed his ruin, by making a temporary alliance among themselves.

The poems that celebrate the ancient Tamil kings and chiefs and the part which they played, are especially fascinating, as they afford an interesting, though meagre, insight into the social, political, religious and economical conditions of southern India. As *Purananuru* is full of such

poems, their value as historical evidence of contemporary civilisation, customs, and manners cannot be over-estimated. Few other works of the time are so rich in information about Tamil society. It is therefore no exaggeration to say that *Purananuru* forms the mirror of the third or the last Sangam age. An attempt is therefore made in the following pages to present, as succinctly as possible, an idea of the state of civilisation of the age. While confining our attention in the main to the contents of this work, we have occasionally referred to contemporary and other literature for the verification of facts stated herein.

Date of Compilation of Purananuru

As indicated already, it belongs to the age of the third Madura Sangam. This is not the place to discuss in detail the age of the three Sangams. Scholars differ considerably in fixing their age. Suffice it to say that scholars have agreed in fixing the date of the third Sangam towards the close of the second century A. D. This Sangam seems to have been dissolved owing to the political confusion caused in the Tamil country by irruption of foreign invaders from the north and the north-west, towards the beginning of the third century A. D., viz., the Gangas, the Kala baras and the Pallavas. Hence this work ought to have been compiled towards the close of the second century before the dissolution of the Sangam.

As regards the antiquity of *Purananuru* verses something can be said definitely. Many of the verses can be shown by a critical examination to have been composed long before the second century. The style and metre, the idiom and grammar, the thoughts, feelings and ideas of a race that flourished at a time even anterior to the Christian era, the very name of the great heroes and heroines that are mentioned in the verses all indicate great antiquity.

The Meaning of Puram

Tamil writers on Ethics, following the lead of the Sanskrit authors, have adopted the fourfold division of subject matter, namely, *dharma* (righteousness), *artha* (wealth or politics), *kama* (erotics), and *moksha* (salvation). Accordingly all things that can form the subject matter of a treatise in Tamil are classified under the above four heads. The last section is regarded as such a very difficult subject that it cannot be easily comprehended by ordinary men, and one in which first-hand information is out of the question. It is, therefore, generally left out of consideration in all treatises on ethics, though it is referred to incidentally (e.g. Kural). Tamil grammarians on the other hand go a step further and sub-divide the subject matter under the two main heads the subjective or *aham*, and the objective or *puram*. The first treats of *kama* (love), the various emotions it can give birth to, the state of the mind of the lover and the beloved, as also of that of others who are associated with them at various times.* The feelings and emotions arising

in their minds can be appreciated only by the parties concerned. They cannot be realised by others; nor can they be explicitly expressed in words by those that feel them. Such emotions are generally clothed in cautious words, and their meaning lies deeper than the words that express them. Like the English lyrics, the Tamil lyrics are more indicative than expressive and contain a delicate analysis of the hundreds of varying moods that agitate the minds of lovers, their friends and relations. This affords scope for endless ramifications in the treatment of love, which has been dealt with fully in special treatises.

Puram on the other hand, treats mainly of righteousness and polity. It refers to *moksha* only incidentally, as indicated above. The sentiments expressed therein are capable of being freely given out, and fully realised by all. The subject-matter of this division, therefore includes a variety of topics like righteous conduct, virtue, war and peace, state-craft, and renunciation. These topics are generally included under the twelve main heads into which Puram is divided, as will be shown later.

This division of the subject-matter into *Aham* and *Puram* will be incomplete, if it is not considered along with the five physiographical divisions of the land adopted by the Tamil grammarians. This is to be found only in Tamil literature and is closely associated with the subject matter of *Aham* and Puram. The following are the five[1] divisions of the land: (1) the hilly regions, (2) the forests, (3) cultivated areas, (4) the maritime tracts, and (5) deserts. This physiographical classification is common to both *Aham* and Puram, though the subject matter dealt with by each is different. As *Aham* treats mainly of love, each of these five divisions of lands is associated with a characteristic, arising from the marital relationship of the couple. Thus, the hilly tracts are associated with their consortship, the forests with their patience under separation the cultivated fields with their Bouderie (feigned differences), the maritime tracts with their sorrows, and the desert areas with their parting. All these are related to a form of marriage, which according to Sanskritists, corresponds to the Gandharva form. This is the oldest and the best appreciated form of marriage among the ancient Tamils, as also the most natural way of effecting a life-long union, in which romance, free choice, karmic activities, and religion all mingle together in one harmonious whole. Mutual choice in a God-sent and casual meeting leads to private consortship, which sooner or later ends in the happy union of the parties with the consent of their parents.

1 Tholkappiyar, the author of the earliest Tamil grammar, is of opinion that there are only four divisions of land, that the desert tract is merely the inter-mixture of any two of the other four, and that its characteristic of parting is common to all the four tracts.

Puram, as already indicated, treats of matters relating to the five tracts other than love and all of them are included in the following twelve[1] main sub-divisions :

1. Vetchi	5. Nochi	9. Padan
2. Karanthai	6. Ulignai	10. Poduviyal
3. Vanchi	7. Thumbai	11. Kai-kilai
4. Kanchi	8. Vagai	12. Perumthinai

Each of these sub-divisions again admits of various minor sub-divisions. A study of these will show us the great heroism exhibited by the ancient Tamils, the ethics of their warfare, the customs observed by them during times of war and peace, and the state of their hoary civilization. A brief description of their wars, with the causes for the same, the state of their defences, the customs observed by them before, during, and after fighting, and the other peculiarities connected therewith would be interesting reading, though no attempt has been made here to narrate them in detail.

Ancient Tamil Society

From references that are to be found here and there in *Purananuru*, as well as in the other classical books of the period, it is possible for us to form a clear idea of the social structure of the period. The South Indian culture in its highly developed state appears to us to be a blend of two cultures—the indigenous Dravidian and the foreign Indo-European. The date of their contact cannot be definitely ascertained at present. From the accounts of the three Sangams, it can be inferred that the Aryan influence was being slowly felt from the days of Agasthyar and his disciple, Tholkappiyar, the latter of whom is believed to have lived before Panini, the great Sanskrit grammarian. The Aryan migration must have therefore taken place still earlier. The first stream of the Brahmans might have come long before the migration of the Velirs who are proved by traditional and literary accounts to have moved south after the close of the Mahabharatha war. It may be taken tentatively that Brahmanical influence began to affect Dravidian civilisation and culture from the 15th century B. C. onwards. References are not wanting in the two epics to show the existence of Brahman colonies and Ashramas in the forest of Dandaka, south of the Vindhyas. The injunctions of those days prohibiting Brahman migration south of the Vindhyan barrier and Kalinga were slowly neglected and finally forgotten in the efflux of time. By the time of Bouthayana, the peculiar customs of the north and of the south had come to be fully understood and

[1] Tholkappiyar classifies the above under seven heads instead of twelve by omitting 2, 5, 10, 11, and 12 in the above list. According to this old author sub-divisions 2 and 5 do not admit of any separate treatment; sub-division 10 will be included in 4, which has been given by him a separate independent treatment to illustrate the uncertainty and evanescence of life, wealth and pleasures in this world; sub-divisions 11 and 12 need not be dealt with in this objective treatment, as they treat of certain phases of subjective love.

distinguished. We might conveniently mark this as the lower limit of the Aryan contact, when the Aryan influence was complete.

The Brahmans from the beginning should have attended to the religious wants of the enterprising northern people, and helped them diplomatically in their colonising activities. The respect that was paid to them from very early times by the Velirs and their kings, who were themselves northern Kshatriyas and hence Aryans, testifies to the truth of our assertion; and the fact that the early Brahman colonisation was encouraged solely with the object of getting priests to minister to the religious wants of the people, and to offer sacrifices for the prosperity of the royal houses and kingdoms, cannot fail to support and confirm our conviction. As they came only in thin streams, their influence must have been at first insignificant. Latterly their influence slowly increased with the increase of their responsibilities. During the time of Tholkappiyar they were given a recognised social status and were considered the leaders and guardians of society.

The indigenous population was at first divided not into castes but into tribes. Their loyalty to their tribal chiefs is too well known to be repeated here. The Aryan system of caste became in later days a model for the crystallisation of Tamil Society according to the professions followed by the members, when both the civilisations had sufficient time mutually to affect each other. Society was divided by Tholkappiyar into four sections thus:—the Brahmans, the kings, the merchants, and the Vellalas. The last included those that cultivated the lands themselves and those that did so through others. The Brahmans were the Aryan immigrants from the north. They were held in very great veneration for the purity and austerity of their lives, for their great learning, and for the atmosphere of love and sanctity they created around them. They were classed along with the cows in point of innocence and inability to protect themselves. Hence it was considered one of the sacred duties of the kings to protect them. They advised the kings in matters of state, and officiated in their sacrifices. The kings gave them lands and villages, free of tax, and also presented them with plenty of gold and large numbers of cows on suitable occasions, so that they might pursue their religious duties without any anxiety about funds. The murder of a Brahman was considered to be a heinous crime.

Among the kings some were pure Tamils and others were of northern origin, though latterly they were classed among indigenous chiefs. Even the three premier Tamil sovereigns traced their descent from the ruling dynasties of the north. This supports the fact that the migration of the Velirs had a great influence upon the later Dravidian culture in all its phases. There were crowned kings among them as well as those who wore coronets and ruled territories as feudatories of the crowned monarchs. The merchant class, though represented to be a separate caste by themselves, did not at first form a distinct caste. It merely indicated that they had come to occupy a recognised social position by virtue of their wealth and enterprise. Next came the Vellalas—the higher and the lower. According to Nachinarkinyar

the higher Vellalas were the big landowners and commanders of the army who at first settled at Pidavoor, Azhunthur, Nagoor, Nangur, Alancheri, Perumchikkal, Vallam, Kizhar and other places in the Chola country, and who were called Vel and Aras (Urs), as well as those who were honoured by the Pandyas with the title of Kavithy and the descendants of their feudatory kings. By virtue of their social status, they became fit to enter into marital relationship with the three premier Tamil sovereigns by giving them their daughters. This title of Aras has now survived among the members of the royal family of Mysore, which now represents one of the oldest branches descended from the Velirs. The lower Vellalas included agriculturists, traders, and the servants of the society. The duties of the above four classes were stated to be as follows :—

1. Brahmans—learning, teaching, sacrificing, officiating at sacrifices, giving alms, and receiving alms.
2. The kings—learning, sacrificing, giving alms, protecting the weak, and administering justice.
3. Merchants—learning, sacrificing, giving alms, cultivating lands, tending cattle, and trade.
4. Vellalas—(a) *higher*: learning, sacrificing, giving alms, cultivating lands, tending cattle, and trade.
   (b) *lower*: learning (excepting the Vedas), giving alms, cultivating lands, tending cattle, trade, and services to others.

A little scrutiny of the above classification of the duties assigned to each class will disclose how elastic was the social arrangement of the early period, and at the same time how ingenious it was. This was certainly an attempt to base the Tamil social organisation upon the four-fold division of the Aryan caste-system. Only certain duties were special to each class and the rest were common to others also. Thus the special duties of a Brahman were to officiate at sacrifices and receive gifts; those of the king to protect the weak and punish the wicked; those of the merchants and the higher Vellalas cultivation, the breeding of cattle and trade; and those of the lower Vellalas, services to others, trade, agriculture, and the breeding of cattle. The higher Vellalas and the merchant class had at first the same duties to perform, even though in actual practice each caste specialised in one walk of life. The merchant class attended to commercial matters, while the higher Vellalas steeped themselves in political affairs. The lower Vellalas were prohibited from reading the Vedas and performing sacrifices. This prohibition is significant. It shows that a large body of agriculturists, who were Dravidians, were added to form the composite Vellala class, and the foreign origin of a portion of that class was slowly being forgotten. All these point to the conclusion that the new Tamil social organisation had not yet become crystallised at this period, and the attempt made to bring under the four orders all the people of South India,

both immigrants and the indigenous, was in a way successful. For under the last division must come all the Tamil tribes, whatever be their origin. It is also very curious to see the existence of a separate merchant class, even though the Vellalas had been given similar duties to perform. This confirms Megasthenes's observation with regard to the division among the Aryans of northern India. In his time he had observed the existence of seven occupational classes instead of four, though it might be thought that more than seven ought to have existed in his time. In the same way the Tamil merchant class should have risen in importance, and those of the Aryan immigrants who had not followed trade as their profession but chose something else should have been included in a different class. Thus in course of time the caste system was established in South India. The rulers became Kshatriyas, and genealogies were either invented for them or were borrowed from those who brought with them the traditions of their northern origin. The merchants became Vaishyas and the rest Sudras, though the Dravidians never called themselves so. In the course of centuries these castes became inelastic and rigid, and gave scope for further subdivisions in each, according to the particular craft or industry, trade or profession, carried on by a community. By the eleventh century in the days of the Chola supremacy, the castes became twenty-seven in number — eighteen right-hand castes and nine left-hand castes. Since then, they have been on the increase, each sub-caste being still further subdivided into narrower communities. In addition to these people, there were also a few foreigners of Greek, Roman and Arabic extraction who made South India their domicile. They had fair complexions, clear-cut faces, red eyes, and wore long robes. They were much patronised by the Tamil kings and were employed by them either as body guards, or as the guards of the palaces. A large wave of floating population also visited the chief ports and towns for commercial purposes.

Administrative Divisions

The old Tamil country was divided into *nadus, kuttram, pattinam* or *pakkam*, *oor* or *sitroor*, *padi*, *palli* or *cheri* and *kuruchi*. *Nadu* was the biggest division, and *pakkam*, *oor*, *cheri* or *kuruchi* the smallest according to the divisions of the country into *neythal*, *marutham*, *mullai* or *kurunji* respectively. The big *nadus* called in later days *mandalam* were ruled by crowned monarchs (முடிவேந்தர்கள்). Under them were subordinate kings (குறுநில மன்னர்கள்) who ruled over a *kuttram*, comprising a number of townships and villages. There were also commanders of the army who were given a similar charge.

The Government was monarchical—a development of the old tribal organisation, and *Purananuru* is full of references thereto. The powers of the king were limited by his council or assembly, over which generally he sued to preside. Hence his will, as is popularly supposed, was not law. In

were received here by the king (Pur. 69). He heard the complaints of various parties in the open court, and settled their differences to their entire satisfaction, by holding the scales even among them (Pur. 6). He punished the wicked as they deserved, always tempering justice with mercy. He rewarded with unstinted liberality those poets and bards who flocked to his court. The next four hours he spent with his wife, relations and children, in the inner apartments of the palace. The royal ladies did not live in seclusion. There was no purdah system among them in the sense in which we understand that term now. The four closing hours of the day were spent in looking after the revenue affairs—the collection of taxes and tribute, and the scrutiny of State charges in their various forms (Pur. 29).

Living as they did in a heroic age, they personally looked into the conduct of war, and fought with the bravest of the enemies' warriors. They acknowledged no superiors. They had great powers in matters of war and peace. They relentlessly extirpated their enemies, but extolled and patronised their friends and dependants. They depreciated other kings in comparison with themselves. They never begged of others anything that they wanted, nor refused any one anything that was asked of them. They never allowed an unfriendly army to step into their territories without vigourous opposition, and never pursued a retreating foe. When they decided on a conquering tour, a grand festival was organised as a preliminary to the gathering of his hosts. When all was ready, they first reduced the countries on the eastern coast of India, then they turned towards the west, and after exacting submission from its princes, proceeded northwards to conquer the Aryan kings of Hindustan. In this way they carried on a campaign around India from right to left, after the fashion of the heroes of the Ramayana and Mahabharatha and of Harsha, Chandragupta, and Vikramaditya of later days (Pur. 31, 225). After such an achievement, their fame would be established among the assembly of kings during the horse-sacrifice or *rajasuya* sacrifice, performed under their auspices. Only the premier Tamil sovereigns are said to have aspired to this position, each at a particular epoch, when the greatness of his house had reached the zenith of prosperity and power. The minor kings also showed considerable capacity as leaders of war, and won fame as patrons of learning and administrators of even-handed justice; but before the three Tamil monarchs they shone on the whole like a candle before a search-light.

The education of royal youths was so adjusted as to fit them for their high and exalted station. They were given a Spartan training so far as their physical development was concerned. From boyhood they were placed under expert tutors, and were trained in the use of arms, in riding on elephants and horses, and in driving chariots. They were taught to appreciate and patronise their mother-tongue. Under them the home speech was kept at a high level of purity, in spite of the free borrowing of words from other languages, but such words were thoroughly Tamilised. A few kings excelled in the art of composing verses. Music and dancing were their favourite diversions and amusements.

The usual way of calling the attention of the people was by the beating of drums. The kings had three kinds of drums known respectively as the war-drum, the justice-drum, and the gift-drum (Pur. 58). They were symbolical of the three great virtues of heroism, justice and charity that should mark every sovereign worthy of the name. When these drums were beaten they would sound differently. Then the people knew for what they were sounded. The king usually divided his time, as stated before, in the pursuit of these virtues. The first of them was considered to be superior to and the preserver of the other two. In consequence, greater respect was paid to the war-drum. They used to bathe it in water, place it in a cot, deck it with peacock-feathers and with wreaths of shining jewels and the tender leaves of a kind of cotton shrub (Oerna lanater-உழிஞை), and worship it daily with offerings of blood (குருதிப்பலி) (Pur. 60). In addition to this visible symbol of the king's heroism, he wore on his body a warrior dress (வீரவுடை), a special wreath (வீரமாலை), and a golden anklet (வீரக்கழல்), indicative of the same virtue.

After all the troubles and anxieties of a long reign, kings have been known to resign their kingdoms in favour of their eldest sons, and to seek the solitude of the forest for performing penance for the salvation of their souls (Pur. 217, 251, 282).

(*To be continued*).

Editorial Notes

In our last issue we referred to the death of two distinguished scholars, Dr. James Hastings and Prof. Rhys Davids. Since then death has left another serious gap in the ranks of English scholarship by the removal of Dr. Bernard Bosanquet. His philosophical work was the continuation of that done by Mr. F. H. Bradley; indeed it was the work done by Bosanquet that was in a sense responsible for Mr. Bradley's rather trying habit of allowing his books to remain out of print in spite of an insistent demand for their re-issue. In his more recent books especially Dr. Bosanquet revealed a breadth and kindliness of outlook which commanded the respect even of those who did not altogether agree with his conclusions. A high seriousness, congruous with the dignity of his subject, a temper which reminded the reader of the unseen and the eternal, an attitude essentially religious towards life, whether the issues were stated in the conventional terms of religion or not pervaded his work, and made him a model which many of his antagonists might imitate with advantage. We pay our tribute of respect to one who in worthy fashion 'held and handed on the torch.'

Any one who studies not merely the proceedings of legislatures but those of humbler societies and the columns of the press can hardly fail to be impressed with the general recognition of the importance of education. But if he tries to discover what they mean by education, what they are all 'driving at,' he will find himself baffled. How many of the experts and the enthusiasts who are for ever talking about education at large, or about technical, vocational, or national education, or any of the other special brands we hear so much about, have any clear idea what education means, why it is necessary, how it is to be obtained or administered, or what part states and governments ought to play in regard to it? Under the system of popular government it is clear that every voter ought to have an educational policy—even that of letting it alone is a definite policy, not to be taken up except for definite reasons like any other policy. Yet on all sides there is a pitiful absence of anything like a clear or consistent policy. And the result is—muddle. We have not space at the moment even to outline an educational policy; but we wish to impress on our readers its importance. Hereafter we may return to it.

We wish to add our congratulations to those which the College Council and Senatus have extended to Professor Ernest deWitt Burton, M.A., D.D. who is the representative of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society on the Governing Board of the College. Dr. Burton has been for many years the head of the department of New Testament in the University of Chicago, and with the retirement of Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, for sixteen years the President of the University, he has been elected to the Presidency. President Burton is a man of wide interests and keen scholarship, as well as of administrative ability, gifts which will mean much in his new position.

IT IS A PLEASURE TO ANNOUNCE the beginning of a series of articles on *Ancient Tamil Society as depicted in the Purananuru*, by Mr. R. Rangachariar, M.A., L.T., Tamil lecturer in the College. The first of the series appears in this issue, and we take this occasion of commending the series to all those who are interested in this important subject. The MAGAZINE has always been glad to publish such researches into the customs and traditions of the Indian peoples. On some points there may be differences of opinion, and our publication of these articles should not be interpreted as taking sides on any of these controversial matters, but rather as our hearty approval of the spirit that prompts such investigations.

What Men Think

Nearer than an Eye-witness

It is a commonplace of modern New Testament scholarship that none of the Gospels aim at mere narration; without exception their purpose is more akin to the preacher's than to the historian's, and hence there enters into their accounts of the deeds and sayings of Jesus an element of added interpretation. It is self-evident, however, that in the Fourth Gospel this interpretative element has a much larger place; otherwise the contrast between its account of Christ's ministry and methods and the Synoptic picture would be quite inexplicable. But, while this much is clear, the problem of sympathetically understanding the Fourth Evangelist's attitude to his historical data is so difficult that every attempt to illumine it deserves hopeful scrutiny. We cannot resist the temptation to cull a few passages from a suggestive article by Dr. R. H. Strachan in the February issue of the *Expository Times*. Dr. Strachan, we may mention in passing, was a temporary professor in the college in 1896–97.

'The historical setting in this Gospel,' says Dr. Strachan, 'really only plays the part of fulcrum to the lever. Thereon the Evangelist finds a place to stand that he may move the world—the Hellenistic world—to a sense of the universal significance of Jesus. He is using a mass of traditional material, partly akin to the Synoptic, partly "Johannine" in character. He has subjected it to a pressure, which is also being exercised in his own soul by a growing and deepening Christian experience.' We quote these sentences only to indicate Dr. Strachan's general position, without claiming that they are peculiarly fresh or striking. We also find ourselves on fairly familiar ground in the following passage. 'The Evangelist uses history—as he found it—as a kind of transparent medium which conveys certain aspects of faith and unbelief. This method of writing pictorial history, in the form of "historical sermons," was a familiar Jewish method. . . The method was known as *haggadah*, a homily founded on portions of the sacred history. In one important aspect the Fourth Gospel may be regarded as the Christian *haggadah*. It was a process of extracting the spiritual as distinct from the "bodily" meaning of a narrative, a process which every homilist to-day adopts.' But now comes the suggestion to which, by means of these quotations, we have been leading up—the ray of light which we wish to pass on. 'There is,' says Dr. Strachan, 'much more than *haggadah* in the Fourth Gospel. There is that universal kind of religious imagination which is the expression of Christian experience in its relation to the facts that lie behind the Gospels; that unchanging dramatic interpretation of scenes and persons whereby the speaker or worshipper is enabled to speak as though he himself were one of the actors in the scene.'

In order the better to develop his suggestion Dr. Strachan interposes a quotation from Freeman's *Essay on Maeterlinck*. 'Love always has a swift and powerful dramatic tendency; and some men whose religious love has been at once profound and transfiguring, have seen the atonement as a constant moving tragedy of sacrifice in which they themselves, with the egoism of supreme humility, have taken a privileged, if supernumerary part. Around the central figure they see ranged all the world, in a vast cirque of multitudinous human experience, and themselves present foremost in the crowd acclaiming or reviling. Except with themselves dramatically present, except in the light of this pious egoism, they do not and could not realize His life and death.'

Turning this psychological observation of Freeman's to use, Dr. Strachan suggests that a similar imaginative process has been at work in the Fourth Gospel. 'The process has been at work all through, but no one can read the writer's dramatic presentations, especially of the betrayal, trial and crucifixion of Jesus, without feeling that they are written by one who has taken part in these scenes more closely and more really than even an actual eye-witness who stood too near the events could do. He has entered more fully into the psychology of Peter's denial than any of the other three evangelists. He shrinks in horror from Judas' deed, vividly depicts the irony of the condemnation by Caiaphas, and realizes the pitiableness of Pilate's moral vacillation to a degree shared by none of the other evangelists. He has, indeed, been there, and has said, 'Lord, is it I?'

Dr. Strachan's suggestion is one, the proper application of which requires some delicacy of psychological insight; it might so easily be abused. Rightly apprehended, however, we think it does shed a ray of light.

The Paradox of Religion

Under this title Dr. Sydney Cave contributes to the February issue of the *Expositor* a study of a book which, although it has already reached its ninth edition, appears still to be the centre of interest in German theological circles. This is Professor Rudolph Otto's *Das Heilige* ('The Holy: On the Irrational in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational'). 'For the understanding of religion, and for the appreciation of its rational and irrational aspects,' says Dr. Cave, 'Otto claims that we need a distinctively religious category, the category of the Holy, a category which can no more be expressed in conceptual terms than can the category of the Beautiful. The Holy, in this sense, is thus a purely religious conception. It includes the ethical, but it is more than the ethical. It has in it something which is distinctive, and peculiar to the sphere of religion, something which, as perfect of its kind, is a primary and elementary *datum*, and, as such, incapable of formal definition.' If our religious life is to be faith and not mere vague feeling, of necessity we must apply to God predicates based upon analogy with what we can understand—the personal and rational predicates by which we construe our own conscious activity and experience. But if this inevitable and healthy tendency is allowed to run its full course unchecked, we are apt to denude our idea of God of the element of the mysterious or 'irrational' or 'numinous'

(to use the term Otto has coined), until our very religion becomes irreligious. For Christianity inevitably shares the paradox of all living religion. 'If we preach only the attractiveness of God, God ceases to attract. If we speak of Him as a sort of Santa Claus whose one work is to make men happy, we must not complain if adult minds cease to believe in His reality. Such was not Christ's preaching. . . God was to Christ supremely the Father, but we miss the wonder of that message if we forget that this God whom Christ bade us call Father was the Numinous, the Holy, the august and majestic God of the Old Testament. . . The Gospel is adequate to the world's need only as it is a paradox.'

To all our readers we commend Dr. Cave's singularly happy appreciation of Otto's book. But readers for whom German is not a sealed language will be well advised to study for themselves in detail the book itself, regarding which that original and independent thinker, Karl Heim, has said that 'the understanding of the peculiarity of religion, which we have been seeking for since Schleiermacher, has entered here a new stadium.'

The Philosophy of Nature

The religious implications of the philosophy of nature are of immense importance for the problem of the relation between religion and science. The January issue of *The Journal of Religion* contains an article by Professor E. C. Moore of Harvard University which discusses in an illuminating way the present issue which has been brought about by the advances of modern science. The mediaeval point of approach was through the appeal to authority. The scholastics offered a method of harmonizing religion and science by keeping both under ecclesiastical control. The efficiency of a scientific hypothesis, as of a religious doctrine, was to be found in its source, rather than in the accuracy with which it accounted for the facts. The framework on which the constructions of thought were built until the days of Kant were definitely dualistic. But that philosopher lifted the ban of dualism, and opened the way for a doctrine of immanence. In the meantime the expanding sciences were compelling the reconstruction of men's thinking about nature. One result of this expansion was that men began to believe in the uniformity of nature. One corrollary of that was the rise of a new naturalism which should take the place of the old naturalism which stood in rigid opposition to supernaturalism. 'The new naturalism includes the supernatural . . . It is a world in which nature is supernatural to the core, and the supernatural is natural to the limit.' In this new conception, the idea of growth as 'the divinest of all things' has taken the place of the thought of everything coming perfect from the hand of God. God is described as 'the embodiment of the principle of the moral and spiritual life of the world. Call that the moral miracle, if you will. Greatest of all wonders it certainly is. All personalities are wonderful, this one most so.' The author retains the word 'miracle,' but he uses it in the sense of something which happens beyond the scope of any cause or law which we know. 'The decisive thing is that we do not think that it happens beyond any law.' But the profound significance of the new naturalism is that it includes a conception of law in nature which, so far from excluding God,

finds Him to be immanent in the process. Immanent, yet transcendent. Yet Dr. Moore realizes that the new view of space-time makes it more difficult for us to define the nature of God's transcendence. The solution is to be found in the fact that God belongs to the realm of values. He does not mean thereby that values are to be set over against facts. 'Our values are our transcending, our decisive, facts. They are our greatest realities.'

Philosophical Motives

The Journal of Philosophy of January 18 included an article by Professor D. S. Robinson of Miami University on *The Chief Types of Motivation to Philosophical Reflection.* The article disclaims any claim to profound thought, and its value is to be found rather in the convenient analysis which the author makes. He recognizes at the outset that 'human motivation is highly complicated and curiously mixed.' At the same time he holds that it is possible to analyze and discover certain dominant types, and it is this which he attempts for philosophical reflection. The chief types which he finds it worth while discussing are four: (i) hedonic, (ii) theological, (iii) sociological, and (iv) scientific. The hedonic motive is peripheral and anthropocentric. It is that motive which leads men to philosophical speculation because of 'a certain personal delight in the mere subtleties of speculation.' The author believes that the theological is a special type of the hedonic motive, and that both 'sacrifice philosophy on the altar of personal satisfaction.' In this case it is believed that if the religious beliefs of men are not philosophically defensible, human happiness is not possible. This motive has had its good fruits, for many a man has found his way to a strong foundation for his religious belief through the maze of metaphysical speculation. The author charged the hedonic and theological types with being peripheral. He says that the sociological is 'worse than peripheral because it deliberately turns its back on the great metaphysical problems as though they were non-existent.' As against the social point of view in philosophy the author maintains that 'man's highest prerogative is not the power to make a better world, but the capacity to know the real world, the reality which he shares.' Thus he deliberately rejects the primacy of the activistic element in man in favour of the epistemological—a view which it is fortunate, for the welfare of humanity, is not unanimously held. The author lends his own influence to the side of scientific motivation, which he defines as 'knowledge for the sake of knowledge.' On this basis he tells us that there are two types of philosophy which are through and through scientifically motivated—Absolute Idealism and Realism. But it may be questioned whether the author's definition of scientific motivation is tenable. A very good case can be made out for the biological motivation in science and in philosophy also. 'That ye may have *life*, and that ye may have it more abundantly' is surely more fundamental than 'that ye may have *knowledge*, and that ye may have it more abundantly.'

What is Education ?

The January number of *Scribner's Magazine* contains an interesting contribution by Professor Percy Marks of Brown University in which the author deals with the important questions of why men go to college, and what they understand by education. He begins by relating a personal experience in which he asked each member of a class of twenty-nine students, an unusually brilliant group, 'Why did you come to college ?' He received only two definite replies to his query of which one was, 'I did not want to come; my father made me,' and the other, 'I do not know why I came.' He then proceeded to ask the men what they meant by the word 'education'. In fact that was a question which he frequently asked of his students in years of teaching with much disappointment in the replies. For many years he sought for a satisfactory answer to his query, and at last he got it, not from a pedagogue, but from a successful business-man, Mr. J. F. Monroe, a member of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It was this: 'A man does not come to college to earn a living; he comes to college to learn to live.' If a man keeps before him that ideal, his years in college will be well spent. When he graduates he has the rudiments of an education. If he continues to work, to think, and to learn, he may, by the grace of God, become a man.

The Gap in the Spectrum

About 120 years ago Young put forward the Wave Theory of Light, and showed how the wave-length of light could be measured. According to this theory, light consists of transverse vibrations in the ether, the wave-lengths varying in the case of visible light from about 7,000 units in the red end of the spectrum to about 4,000 units in the violet, that is, over rather less than one octave. (The unit used is 0·1 millimicron or one ten-millionth of a millimetre.) The solar spectrum has been found to contain much radiant energy not visible to the eyes. Beyond the red, several octaves of waves have been detected and measured by thermometric methods using rock salt or sylvine prisms and lenses. These waves are what is usually called radiant heat; most of the solar energy reaching the earth is of this nature. Beyond this there are the Hertz waves used in wireless telegraphy.

They vary in wave-length from a fraction of a centimetre almost up to infinity. On the other side of the visible spectrum there is the ultra-violet light. Ordinary glass is opaque to this kind of radiation, but by using quartz and fluorite prisms and lenses in a vacuum, and by recording photographically, several octaves have been investigated. The smallest wave length measured in this way was about 150 units in length. There are theoretical reasons for supposing that all substances will be opaque to waves of smaller length and so no further advance is to be expected with this type of apparatus. By using a concave grating instead of a prism and lenses, measurements had been made down to 900 units by 1913. About this time the Braggs and Moseley showed that X-rays consist of vibrations of the same nature as light, and they were able, by using crystals as gratings, to

measure the wave-length of these vibrations. The length of the longest wave of X-rays measured by them was about 12 units. Between these soft X-rays and the most extreme ultra-violet light then measured there remained a gap of about six octaves still to be explored.

In May Professor Richardson at the Royal Institution gave an account of the attempts that have been made to advance into this region. Recently, Lyman, by using a greatly improved vacuum grating spectroscope and very high tension sparks between metal terminals, has succeeded in producing and measuring radiations of wave-lengths down to 144 units. Richardson himself has shown that there are theoretical reasons for believing that there is an upper limit to the frequency of the radiation given by the atoms of the various elements. He has devised a complex thermionic apparatus for measuring these limits, and he and his co-workers have determined these values for a number of metallic elements. On calculating the wave-lengths corresponding to each of these limiting values, it was found that they extend into the X-ray region measurable by the crystal grating method. Thus the gap in the spectrum has in a way been bridged, and the similarity in nature of X-rays and ordinary light has been confirmed. The whole gamut of these waves, from Hertz-waves many miles long to X-rays a small fraction of a micron in length, may be said now to be known.

Another Element

Eighty-six elements are known to chemists at present, and for theoretical reasons the discovery of not more than six new elements may be expected. The announcement of the discovery of a new element is therefore of very great interest. A few weeks ago Hevesy and Coeter announced that, working in Bohn's laboratory in Copenhagen, they had detected by the X-ray method an element of atomic number 72 in a Scandinavian mineral. This element they named *hafnium*. Dr. A. Scott, who had for some time been studying certain titaniferous sands from New Zealand, was reminded by this report of some very refractory oxides he had obtained from these sands. After further work, Dr. Scott announced to a meeting of the London Chemical Society that he believed he had succeeded in separating hafnium oxide, and in determining approximately its atomic weight. Specimens of this oxide have been sent to Copenhagen for examination by the X-ray method. This element is said to be a homologue of titanium and zirconium.

If this report be correct, a rather interesting case arises. Professor Urbain of Paris, a year or so ago, published an account of the discovery of a rare earth element of atomic number 72. He called this *celtium*. Either of these reports may prove to be incorrect on further investigation, or there may be two elements with the same atomic number. This latter suggestion is not impossible, but no other example of such a case has been found with the 86 definitely known elements, and the probability is thus against an exception. The atomic number of an element is believed to be the difference between the number of protons and the number of electrons constituting the nucleus of its atom. Different elements

may have the same chemical properties or the same atomic weight, but the atomic number has always been regarded as quite unique. In most cases of doubt, reference to the periodic table will at once decide what properties an element of a certain atomic number should have, but strange to say, the position of element 72 is one of the very few cases where there are two possibilities. Until more work has been done, it is thus impossible to decide whether celtium and hafnium both exist or only one of them.

Book Reviews

Redemption from this World, or the Supernatural in Christianity (*Cunningham Lectures*). By A. G. Hogg, M. A. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922. Pp. xiv+278. Price 7s. 6d., net.

For readers of the MAGAZINE and old students of the College this book hardly requires anything in the way of introduction. It is a book which has been awaited with no small expectation, ever since it was known that Mr. Hogg had been invited to deliver the Cunningham Lectures. Indeed expectation really began much earlier than that, as his previous work on *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* had established on the one side a demand, on the other something like an implied promise, that a further contribution to the exploration of the miraculous should some day complete what that book had begun. This expectation has now been fulfilled.

Many readers will probably feel a certain amount of disappointment in reading the book—but that is perhaps one of its merits. When the *Message* was in our hands it was almost inevitable that the question in the reader's mind was more or less explicitly: Ought we to be working miracles? Failing to find in the book a plain yes or no, he was left with a sense of dissatisfaction, of unrest, which was hard to bear, but perhaps salutary. Mr. Hogg comes much nearer to a definite answer to that question in the new book, but it is doubtful if he has quite settled the doubts of those who will ask the question. Without making an exhaustive analysis of the argument, it is hardly possible to formulate the criticism without seeming too summary; but there are two directions in which it seems to the reviewer that this dissatisfaction will press on the reader. (1) The practical advice is tentative which is in many ways much better than being dogmatic, and so far a point for which the author deserves to be commended: but it is disappointing to the reader who wants *conclusions*, and (as will be shown later) the practical issue is really an important part of the argument, and the 'plain man' is so far justified of his impatience. (2) The case presented will seem to many readers unconvincing. It is not a question of framing an apologetic for the conviction of the non-Christian, though in the long run what is useful for the one purpose is useful for the other. As Mr. Hogg recognizes, the urgent need is to satisfy the mind of the Christian who is in uncertainty on the score of miracles. 'Either we must, like the decriers of the miraculous, level down the credited achievements of New Testament times to the standard of what modern experience can corroborate, or else we must level up our estimate of the kind of marvels which modern faith may permissibly attempt to the height of those with which we credit our Master and His first disciples.' But does Mr. Hogg recognize the ground on which the mind of so many in the Church has become uneasy on the subject of miracles? That is a question we shall not attempt to answer. Our

own judgement would have no value for any but ourselves. The reader who feels the difficulty must find his own answer. Undoubtedly this is an exacting book. Just for that reason we strongly urge that it should be read—not hurriedly, but thoughtfully and with due diligence. Uncertainty on the issues here dealt with is paralysing: the very eagerness with which many have turned to such books for an 'authoritative ruling' is a testimony to this. The book (wisely, we think) does not give the ruling: but it gives a discussion the earnestness and thoughtfulness of which challenge attention, and the reader who grapples with it will find in the reading not pastime, or that ready tickling of our emotions which is often mistaken for edification, but something to brace and discipline his spirit, and out of the working of many minds there may come a more definite doctrine and practice than any one is in a position to give to-day.

Space does not permit a systematic discussion of the argument of the book point by point: to give a continuous synopsis would not be difficult; but it would minister at once to the weakness of those who shrink from the task of reading a difficult book, and to the reviewer's own reluctance to embark on a task at once arduous and, as it may seem to some, graceless. But the most useful thing is to suggest some points where the line taken by the author seems to require either fuller statement, or fuller consideration, as an aid alike to the present reader and to the fuller investigation of a momentous question, whether by the present author or by others.

Broadly, it may be said that the crux of the matter lies very largely in implications and presuppositions which call for a very much fuller investigation than Mr. Hogg has been able or willing to give them. It is here that we feel the force of the 'plain man's' demand not merely as the expression of impatience but as a pertinent argument. Ought we who call ourselves Christians to be working miracles to-day? Mr. Hogg does not quite get to the point of saying in set terms, we ought, though he certainly comes near it. But before you can accept an affirmative, however confidently given, as final, perhaps even before we attempt to find an answer, there is another question: Why do you want to work miracles? Ought you to desire it at all? Granted the first age of the Church witnessed miracles, the apologist of miracles as a practical thing to-day (and for the matter of that his opponent also) must sooner or later face the question, when, and why, did the Church leave off, and allow the practice of working miracles to fall into disuse? Mr. Hogg's reference to the claims made for Lourdes and for Christian Science shows that he appreciates this point to some extent: but it does not seem to us that he goes far enough. Impatience is always in favour of short cuts. This book breathes impatience: but the impatience which would find an outlet in miracle, though very intelligible, is not necessarily Christian because it appeals to Christian precedents, and a patient searching of the thought that lies behind the desire for miracle might lead Mr. Hogg to reconsider many things.

Another large issue on which we should question Mr. Hogg's implications is what we commonly call 'Nature' and the way in which it is handled by the man of science. Here again, there is a note of impatience. Mr. Hogg, partly by reason of his sensitiveness to a strain of thought that is especially congenial to the

Indian mind, pooh-poohs the idea that what we call 'nature' is in any way adequate as an expression of God. There remains a fact which not only the men of science who are also Christians (and they are more than the mere handful we sometimes affect to believe) but also a large number of Christians who make no claim to any competence in science may pertinently urge, to which it seems to the reviewer Mr. Hogg does scant justice, that after all it is the way in which God Himself has chosen to express Himself. We need not say that it is exhaustive or final: but we must ask, why did God choose this mode of self-expression? From many things in the book you might almost infer that science had invented ways of circumscribing the activity of God to suit some supposed convenience of its own. Mr. Hogg does not seem to realize that the categories of science and its 'laws' are not reached *a priori* but by a long and diligent consideration of phenomena which to the religious man must be construed as the product of the mind of God. Indeed his attitude to science throughout is unfortunate, and likely to lend colour to the charge of obscurantism which is often levelled at the Church. Once again the reader feels the note of impatience: it seems as if the writer (to use a popular phrase) has no use for science. This seems to many of us alike unwise and unfair. It is not simply that Christian charity pleads with us to be conciliatory, though that is an argument not lightly to be set aside. It is even more because the conclusions of science seem to us to be a part of that many-sided self-revelation of the mind of God which the child of God can ignore only at his peril. In his disparagement of the generalisations of science Mr. Hogg says (we paraphrase advisedly) it is no matter for surprise if they sometimes break down; the surprise is that they break down so seldom. To develop an illustration with as close an approximation as possible to Mr. Hogg's own words:—the orderliness of a system of rules has proved in fact so close an approximation to the living and spontaneous orderliness of a perfect intelligence, to an intelligent anticipation of the path along which the living wisdom of God makes the course of things to run, that the man of science is able to predict for us to the hour and minute the occurrence and the visibility of a solar eclipse, and to trace the results of cosmic processes which must have been in operation ages before man had life on the planet at all. The wonder, according to Mr. Hogg, is that the approximation is so close; not that it is not closer. We are not by any means sure that the approximation is a matter for wonder: that depends on your whole reading of the mind of God. But we are quite sure that it is significant. If with the author, you feel it to be marvellous, you ought to ponder and investigate it more fully. In our own view, the whole scheme of modern science, its reading of the manifold workings of what for us also is the 'living wisdom of God,' is a thing not of scientific concern only, but of far-reaching religious significance.

We do not believe that anything is to be gained by the attempt to discredit science in the interest of miracle, which is the construction many will feel driven to put on this book. The generalisations of science, as we have said, are not forced by science but accepted by it from the observation of the facts. They may be imperfect: they may seem wrongly to rule out what religion calls miracle. The simplest, and at the same time unanswerable, corrective, is to work a miracle

—which is what Mr. Hogg seems to hanker after. But he evidently has his doubts, which we cordially share, as to the propriety of attempting to work a miracle for the sake of confounding science.

It is in keeping with this mistaken attitude towards science that Mr. Hogg gives an interpretation to the Biblical story of the Fall (which some may have heard from him before) which we believe to be radically false. The keynote of that story—at best an imperfect account of human depravity—is not 'man's distrustful determination to see for himself whether the divinely forbidden is really as dangerous and hurtful as he has been taught,' but a conviction (falsely inspired by the tempter) that as a matter of fact it is not—in other words—a disastrous attempt to 'call' what he is foolishly persuaded is no more than a 'Divine bluff.' The determination to see for himself as it issues in 'science' or the comprehensive endeavour to understand the world in which God has set him is in our thinking divinely implanted in man, and we deprecate any attempt to discredit it. It is also dangerous, if not suicidal: for Mr. Hogg himself would be hard put to it for argument if we ruled out as invalid all that process of generalisation on which the philosopher as well as the scientist must work.

Further, the life and work of many men of science (Newton and Pasteur may be cited as illustrious and sufficient examples) are characterized by a child-like simplicity of mind and nobility of character which are surely not foreign to the Kingdom of God as our Master sets it forth. Patience and humility are qualities we cannot disregard. And if we judge men by their services to mankind, the men of science can again make out a strong case. It is true that many of the gifts of science have been abused—as we saw in the world war. But can we hold science itself accountable for that? In the resources of science man has in his hands, if he would but use them in a Christian temper, all that he needs to banish much of that ugliness and suffering whose existence Mr. Hogg very rightly deplores, without resort to 'miracle,' so suspiciously like a short cut to save us from the consequences of our own wanton folly and sin.

The truth is, as it appears to us, Mr. Hogg has not fully grasped where the difficulty as to miracle is most acute. It is to a great extent the best minds, and not the worst, both within and without the Church, that feel the difficulty. The irreligious man is not specially opposed to miracle nor particularly faithful to science. He is characteristically ready to swallow the claims of charlatans, to give credit to mediums, mascots, horoscopes and talismans, which are as repugnant to true science as they are to true religion. But the more thoughtful man is hesitant, and reluctant to commit himself on the score of miracles. He has not in most cases thought the thing out fully—it is to be hoped that in many cases this book may stimulate the effort to do so: but what is in his mind seems to be something like this. (1) Much that has been put forward as miracle is certainly not miraculous—either because it is not fact, or because on further analysis it proves to conform to scientific laws. (Even Mr. Hogg comes very near at points to the solution of 'miracle' as the intervention of a higher 'law' which at one time found acceptance with the orthodox, but is now generally discarded as really a shirking of the central issue.) (2) Miracle really proves

nothing. The character of God is of more moment to us than His power. But His goodness, if a reality, does not require a miracle to prove it; if not a reality it will not be established by a score of miracles. And an insistence on miraculous assistance as the portion of the chosen of God might stimulate false motives for obedience—as both the author of the Book of Job and Plato in the earlier part of his *Republic* have so tellingly suggested. In this connexion our Lord's consistent refusal either to work a 'sign' or to build on the kind of faith which His miraculous powers elicited seems significant. (3) It remains to be demonstrated that miracle is necessary Undoubtedly the world abounds in evils which we cannot regard as anything but foreign to the mind of God. But have we used to the full the 'ordinary' resources of God? When we have learned to love one another, to work for the common good and not for self, to love light and to hate darkness in all its forms—ignorance, vice, ill-will, class or race hatred, and so on—it will be time enough to ask God to bring to bear His 'extraordinary' powers for the fulfilment of His purpose. Through the medium of discovery, of science, God has entrusted to the hands of men enormous powers or 'talents.' It is surely one of the most conspicuous features of recent life and thought that we are forced to recognize in increasing measure the solidarity of mankind: and perhaps there is no line along which there is greater need for the Church to re-define its utterance. We are members one of another, not only in the brotherhood of Christ, but in our common humanity; and not the individual only, but the community, the nation and in the long run the whole race, must answer for the use or abuse of its 'talents' according to the standards which Christ has defined and which no man has succeeded in impugning—for the common good, for the glory of our Heavenly Father who bestows those gifts for the blessing of all His children, and not for the behoof of those who happen in His providence to be their custodians. Has the modern world been faithful in the use of its 'talents'? He would be a bold man who would say Yes. But until we have used to the full according to God's purpose the powers He has already given to us, how can we ask for more? Our impatience at disaster and suffering, at disease and wrong, which leads some to doubt the goodness of God, is turned in the wrong direction. If all men (including those who grumble) would do their part, how many evils would vanish to-morrow.

We should be sorry if in what seemed to be necessary criticism we failed to impress on the reader that there are many admirable and beautiful things in the book. We confess that we like Mr. Hogg best when he is least argumentative. There are passages here, as there were in the *Message*, which will stir the heart to a deeper consecration. And perhaps it is there, and not in argument, that we are to find not only the chief value of the book, but also the solution of our still remaining puzzles about the miraculous. 'If I am really . . . on the business of the Divine King. . . . . in the capacity of a son. . . then all the resources of our Father's empire of reality must needs be at my call for the legitimate requirements of my errand.' We agree entirely with the writer at such a point. But what does your errand demand? Most of us would sorrowfully confess that we do not know. 'The sureness of His intuition'—a phrase

Mr. Hogg uses of our Lord—puts us to shame. He seemed to *know*; we grope and fumble. But the way to share His knowledge, as the last chapter of the book emphasizes, is not the way of argument, but the way of obedience to the Father's will—obedience that need not be blind, obedience animated by a full and sympathetic understanding, yet in its spirit and temper the obedience of a little child; 'for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.'

F. E. C.

The Home of the Indo-Europeans. By Harold H. Bender, Princeton, U.S.A. Princeton University Press (Madras: Oxford University Press), 1922. Pp. 58 and two coloured maps.

Professor Harold H. Bender of the Department of Indo-Germanic Philology, Princeton University, approaches the problem of the original home of the Indo-European or Indo-Germanic peoples from the point of view of comparative philology. In this little monograph he has summed up the evidence in regard to the problem. That is achieved through an examination of a number of words in the Sanskrit, Iranian, Greek, Latin, Russian, Anglo-Saxon and other kindred languages which are traceable to a common Aryan root. In that way he very properly holds that it is possible to reconstruct a great deal of the domestic, political and religious practices of the Indo-Europeans.

The book does not bring to bear much new light on this old problem, but it possesses the merit of summing up in convenient form the evidence to hand and of indicating the present state of the discussion. The particular words which the author choses to throw light on the problem are names of plants, trees, and animals, the obvious advantage of this study being that climatic changes have been too slight to make any appreciable difference in regard to the habitat of vegetable and animal life from that age to the present. For example the word for 'tortoise' is not common to all Aryan languages, so evidence based upon it is invalid. The 'beech' is a tree to which much reference is made, and its habitat is restricted to south of 60°; neither is it found in the southern peninsulas of Europe nor in Asia beyond a narrow strip in Asia Minor. The best established Indo-European tree is the silver birch, which does not grow north of latitude 45°, and is only found east of the Vistula River. Professor Bender adds to this philological evidence other testimony from anthropology and archaeology, with special reference to the utensils and implements which were in use. He finds it convenient to fill up the gasp in this evidence also from comparative philology.

The cumulative results of the evidence examined leads the author to support the argument for a European home for the Indo-Europeans, and to reject the Asiatic hypothesis on philological grounds. 'The great plain of central and south-eastern Europe, which embraces roughly the present Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, and Russia south and west of the Volga' is the location which satisfies best the available evidence. The argument is presented in a simple straight-forward way which lends to it confidence and attractiveness.

Hymns from the Rigveda. By A. A. Macdonell. Calcutta: Association Press, 1922. Pp. 98. Cloth, Re 1-8. Paper, Re. 1.

This volume is the latest addition to the Heritage of India series. It contains a very brief general introduction on the date, composition, form and contents of the *Rigveda*, a translation in verse of forty Rigvedic hymns, the translation of each hymn being prefaced by a short account of the deity addressed or subject dealt with. The work is scholarly, indeed the author's name is sufficient guarantee of this. It is to be regretted that the first paragraph of the introduction is so condensed as to fail in lucidity. The scholar will no doubt follow the argument, but the layman, approaching the subject for the first time, will find it puzzling; yet it is obviously for the layman that the little book is planned. In respect of matter and interpretation, the book contains nothing new, nothing not readily accessible before, thus contrasting with Dr. Barnett's recent book in the 'Wisdom of the East Series,' *Hindu Gods and Heroes*, wherein is propounded a thesis that the religion of the Aryans is not as usually represented a worship of personifications of natural forces, but a worship of spirits, sometimes the spirits of real persons, sometimes imaginary spirits. There is however a novel element in Dr. Macdonell's treatment of his subject: it consists in the form of the translation, in the attempt to render the hymns into verse corresponding as nearly as possible to the original metres. A short account of the three chief metres employed in the *Rigveda*, the Triṣṭubh, the Gāyatri and the Jagati, is given in the general introduction. Of the hymns translated the majority are in the Triṣṭubh. There are hymns also in the Gāyatri, Anuṣṭubh, and Jagati metres; and instances occur of stanzas of the Uṣṇih, Bṛhati and Prastārapaṅkti metres, one of each, in hymns predominantly of another metre. There is no doubt that the author has succeeded in reproducing something of the melody and rhythm of the Vedic metres: and so has made it more possible for the English reader to appreciate the poetic beauty of these Vedic hymns and to feel the spirit which animates them.

G. M.

Notes on Islam. By Sir Ahmed Hussain, K.C.I.E., C.S.I. (Nawab Amin Jung Bahadur). Collected and edited by Khan Bahadur Hajee Khaja Muhammad Hussain Hyderabad: Government Central Press, 1922. Pp. 97.

These 'Notes' were written by the author, one of the 'old boys' of the Madras Christian College, to his sons and his brothers when they were students abroad, and are now collected and printed. The author freely admits that they do not represent the views of orthodoxy on the subjects treated, neither are they altogether heretical. One cannot but admire the broad and generous yet truly devout atmosphere which the book breathes—the spirit of real religion. There is a good deal of satisfaction in reading such a book as this, and such an article as Prof. Radhakrishnan's '*The Heart of Hinduism*' in *The Hibbert Journal* for October, 1922. It makes us feel that the Madras Christian College is performing a vital service in helping the leaders of Indian life and thought to seek out the best in their own religions, and to do what they can to purify them from

formalism and superstition. For we feel that whatever breathes the spirit of truth and purity and love breathes the spirit of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

There are points on which we differ from the author such as that Islám accords better than any other religion with modern scientific ideas. That is a question which involves the consideration of historical evidence. One of the merits of the book and its author is the welcoming of helpful criticism, the evidence of which is the publication of a criticism by Mr. J. C. Molony, I. C. S. But criticism of such a book must be kindly in spirit, and marked by appreciation and sympathy.

The Minor Prophets. By the Rev. Canon Sell, D.D. with a Foreward by Bishop Whitehead. Madras: Diocesan Press, 1922. Pp. xiii+77. As. 14.

The Songs of the Outlaw and Other Songs. By Canon Sell, with a Foreword by Bishop Waller. Madras: Diocesan Press, 1922. Pp. xi+134. Rs 1-4-0.

After Malachi. By Canon Sell, with a Foreword by Bishop Gill. Madras: Diocesan Press, 1923. Pp. viii+78. As. 14.

Canon Sell has written these three useful little volumes with the needs of the Indian Christian minister in mind. Their purpose is to disseminate information in a form that will be within reach of those who are neither highly educated nor well enough off to purchase more expensive books, and it must be gratefully acknowledged that the author has admirably succeeded. The style is not too technical for his readers, and at the same time he has succeeded in summing up *multum in parvo.*

The volume on *The Minor Prophets* devotes a section to each of them, in which the setting of the book is described and the prophet's message depicted, both in that situation and in its application to present day needs. The second volume is an exposition of some of the historical psalms, and while not intended to be an exhaustive commentary on that book, has given a very stimulating treatment of those selected. The volume entitled *After Malachi* gives a brief summary of the important Apocalyptic and Apocryphal books, together with a description of the times in which they were written—the period between the Old and New Testaments. A knowledge of this period is exceedingly necessary for an understanding of certain conceptions current in New Testament times, and should serve as a corrective regarding some extravagant millennial doctrines being preached in India as elsewhere.

The Jesus' Way. By Rev. R. A. Hume, M.A., D.D. Madras: C.L.S. 2 annas.

This short pamphlet by an experienced and distinguished Christian worker in India is an attempt to provide the essential principles of the Christian religion for readers in India to-day. Faced by the unfortunate tendency to regard Christianity as a religion of the West and as something which one can be born into like Hinduism, Dr. Hume brings us back to Jesus as the wisdom and the power of God—not doctrines about Him, nor the practices of those who take His name. 'It is a person whom men need, not systems.'

'The Jesus' way of life is the way in which Jesus lived in which He invites all men to live, and in which He will help men to live.' It is a matter of experience and therefore proof follows, and does not precede, the test. To enjoy the proof we must begin by trusting some one who has had the experience; and the best one to trust is Jesus, who successfully followed His way. His way was not to follow His own will and please Himself, but ever and always to find what was His Father's will and to perform that.

'Faith is not an intellectual conviction. It is a recognition of a goodness in some one in whom we trust, and then a reaching after and progressively a realizing imitation of the one trusted.' For this humility is necessary.

The proper Christian ideal is to gratify every desire so far as it is consistent with universal love. Yet to leave some particular desire ungratified is far better than through selfishness to sacrifice another's welfare and so to fall out of the way.

'Love is the law of the Jesus' way—but the limited capacity of some men puts limits even on love. Affections that are holy are not to be given to those who will misinterpret them in terms of selfishness or sensuality. When the whip of small cords promises to be more effective in bringing heartless men to their senses, love will use that as the Master did. Whether a man is or is not a disciple of Jesus does not depend on whether he practices non-resistance or resistance in any particular case. Were he to follow either line exclusively he would thereby fail to be a follower of the Master who inculcated and practised both resistance and non-resistance. Jesus' way only requires that both our resistance and our non-resistance shall spring from love for the person concerned.'

From these quotations it will be seen how strong and true this guidance is for young feet in India to-day.

J. N. A.

The Way of Prayer. By the Rev. E. S. Oakley, M.A. Madras: C.L.S. Re. 1.

This book is an attempt to arouse a new interest in prayer as the motive power of religion. It is simply and clearly written and each chapter ends with a printed prayer. It should be very suitable for those who are beginning to face the problems of the prayer life, but will hardly satisfy those who have gone some distance along the road.

A Study of Caste. By P. Lakshmi Narasu. Madras: K. V. Raghavulu, 1922. Pp. viii+160. Rs. 1-8.

The present volume is written from the standpoint of the social reformer rather than the historian. It is an elaboration of a number of articles written to a weekly periodical devoted to social reconstruction. As such it does not mince matters in the least, but proceeds directly to the attack, and in the course of 160 pages a most formidable attack is lodged against the caste system. The book gives evidence of a good deal of reading and thought on the problem under discussion.

To say that the view point is not that of the historian is not to assert that the author has not used history. Quite to the contrary, he has devoted the first hundred pages to historical matters concerning the problem under discussion. For the most part this treatment is well done, though it must be admitted that the author rather unduly emphasizes the conflict between Buddhism and Brahmanism in accounting for the development of the caste system. He is not always happy in his psychological interpretations of the phenomena of magic and religion. For instance he tells us that religion 'contains necessarily some explanation of nature.' Höffding's *Philosophy of Religion* is a good corrective for that view. He emphasizes the fact that it is the task of religion to evaluate, whereas science deals with explanations, and that it is when religion enters the domain of science that trouble comes.

Certainly we cannot allow his treatment of Christianity to go unchallenged. To make a general statement that 'Christianity to-day has no moral power left and means little more than hypocritical attachment to puerile dogma' is to betray an ignorance as pathetic as it unreasonable. Surely the author has had opportunities enough to know better than to assert that Christianity 'can do nothing with peoples with any pretensions to culture.' But the utter disregard for historical truth is nowhere more plain than when he calls the Christianity of Abyssinia 'unadulterated pristine Christianity.' We have no desire to whitewash the wrongs which have been associated with the name of Christianity. The unfortunate tendencies to dogmatism and formalism which have periodically appeared have dimmed its power and vitality. But one would have either to be blind or to deliberately close one's eyes to history to affirm that these were all the facts. It would be nearer the truth to say that there never has been any power, religious or otherwise, in human history which has paralleled the religion of Jesus in inculcating the spirit of love, truth, freedom, purity, and the highest culture. It is not an accident that 'the improved morality of Christian countries' which the author recognises, 'goes hand in hand with scientific appliances and democracy.'

The section which deals with the influence of the British Government is unfair and already anachronous, in its references to Ireland and Egypt. Could any statement be more ludicrous than that 'no attempt has been made by the Government to dot the country with those school houses which are the indispensable preliminary to a new social and political order? Does the author realise the magnitude of the task and expense which confronts the British administration as compared with the American administration in the Philippine Islands?

The book is a very poor production of the printer's art. In spite of a long list of errata, there are many more which have not been included. Moreover the arrangement is poor. Indeed there is very little arrangement, and 160 pages with no division into chapters is a trial to the patience of the reader. The author is not a student of social psychology, and that science would help him to make his judgements more fair, for it must be admitted that no system, however many its defects, would have survived as long as caste unless it had served

some useful function. We offer no apology for caste. It ought to go, for the sake of India's progress and welfare. But that should not blind us to its functional significance.

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS RECEIVED

Arpana. By M. Srinamamurty, Maharajah's College, Vizianagram. Vizianagram: S.V.V. Press, 1922. Pp. 46. Re. 1. A book of prayers and meditations breathing the longings and aspirations of a *bhakta* for his Lord.

Students' Noble Path or After Examination, What? By Shiv Dass, B.A., B.T. Lahore: Capital Industrial Bureau, 1922. Pp. 22. As. 2. A pamphlet of advice to students, badly printed.

Indian Christian Review, Vol. I, No. 1. Edited by the Rev. D. A. Yardi, B.A., Procter Road, Bombay 4. A new 'illustrated monthly magazine in English devoted to the interests of the Indian Christian community.'

The Health, Vol. I. No. 1. Edited by Dr. U. Rama Rau, M.L.C., 323 Thambu Chetty Street, Madras. Annual subscription Re. 1-8. A monthly journal 'devoted to healthful living,' the initial number of which promises well.

The Hyderabad Youth, Vol. I, No. 1. Edited by D. Jagannath Rao, Hughes Town, Hyderabad, Deccan. A monthly magazine 'dedicated to the rising generation of the State.' Annual subscription Rs. 2-8.

Administration Report of Travancore, 1921-22, and the Address of the Dewan at the opening of the nineteenth session of the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly.

College Notes

COLLEGE DAY was celebrated on New Year's day. The attendance of former students was better than last year but was far from what it should be. The repeated notification in the papers helped to bring in a good many: but there were many who would have come but for its being New Year's Day. The question of changing the time of year when a gathering like this should be held was seriously considered at the business meeting; but no conclusion was arrived at. The company grew from more to more till it adjourned to the Anderson Hall, where a large number of present and former students were gathered. The proceedings commenced with the singing of the College Ode and the toast of the King-Emperor given by the Chairman Rao Bahadur R. N. Arogiaswamy Pillay, B. C. E., Superintending Engineer, Central Circle. This was responded to by the singing of the National Anthem. In proposing the toast of the Madras Christian College Mr. Arogiaswamy Pillai said:—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN AND BROTHER ALUMNI,

Of all honours that I appreciate, I value none more than that of being called upon to preside at this gathering of the alumni of the Madras Christian College; and here I am in obedience to your call, blazing in the unwelcome limelight, where others, worthier than I, have stood. With a heart too full for words I can only say in the language of the heart—I thank you.

To-day the old students of the College have gathered here from far and near, as pilgrims at the shrine of a saint, and as children, who had been separated from their mother gather at the old family home to cheer her and tell her that wherever they were their love for her remained unchanged and unchangeable, and to wish her a Happy New Year and many returns of the same.

As I stand here, I feel rushing over me a tumult of pleasure and of pain, associations so dear and so sacred, yet not unmixed with sorrow; and as I look around me, I feel as if these walls and the noble pile of buildings yonder were instinct with life again, to tell us of men who lived, loved us and laboured for us, men, who though now gone to their reward, live with us still in our affections and will live there as long as life shall last.

Five and forty years ago, I entered this Institution at the impressionable age of seven, and it is now thirty years since I left this College, after passing through every form and class. It was from this nursery, that the first germs of those fertile and fair ideas were wafted into my mind—as in the case of hundreds and hundreds like me—ideas which have come to flower on their native soil and returning to seed have been carried by the winds, I know not whither, calling up endless diversities of the same plant, according to the climate and ground to which they were borne by chance. It was here that I was nursed—as many and many others

like me have been—with the fairy tales of science, and with the truths of that higher science on which the College lays so much stress.

During the many years I spent here, I came into personal contact with all the great men who have made the College what it is to-day, men who not only made it, extended it and embellished it, enabling it, to afford visible evidence of the magnitude of its work, but who also laid the foundations of its unique inner life on the principles of love and sacrifice, self-reliance and reverence, and on that humble, faith in God that opens heaven alike to the wisest philosopher as to the simplest peasant.

The founder of this institution, the Rev. John Anderson, died in 1855 before I was born; but I have heard my father speak of him with affection and regard. My earliest impressions of people connected with this institution are those relating to the late Mrs. Anderson who was a great friend of my father; and I well remember the kind old lady when she visited my father bringing with her always some presents for me and my brothers.

Of him, who was the maker of the present Christian College, the best of teachers and the truest of friends, of Dr. Miller, who is now so far off and yet so near us, how shall I speak in measured language? He laboured among us for forty-seven years and raised the old school to the status of a first-grade College. In his work he had the unstinted help of such eminent teachers and organizers as Dr. Cooper that kind philosopher and friend, Dr. Russell, who was the chief financier of the College and collector of funds for the large extensions carried out, Dr. Skinner, the memory of whose self-sacrificing work and devotion are still fresh in our memories, and Dr. Macphail, who is here with us to-day and to whom I offer my felicitations as the connecting link between three generations of students of this College. In a few years the College became the premier educational institution in Southern India, a position that it maintains to the present day. We see the hand of God in the fact that he, who could have moulded the decrees of states, and shaped the whisper of thrones, chose to be a teacher, and devoted his great talents for well nigh half a century to the education of the youth of this Presidency, giving freely of his intellect and money. The Hostels attached to the College, the Teachers' Retiring Fund, and many scholarships, studentships and prizes, are the results of his generous benefactions. In the results of his work, he has been wonderfully blessed. The students of the College occupy the highest place in the service of the State, and in the Councils of the Empire; and may I mention also that more numerous class, who, though not clad in purple and gold, are a credit to the College in their humbler walks, holding steadfast to the highest calls of duty and truth. The statue that stands outside, facing the College, for which he devoted his life-work, is but a poor memorial of our gratitude; but in the hearts and affections of his students, scattered over the length and breadth of this land, he has carved for himself a memorial more worthy of him than bronze or marble.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall not linger further amidst the memories of the past. I have complete faith in the present and in the future of the College. In Dr. Macphail, who has given nearly forty years of his life to the work of this College, and his colleagues, we have men who have been trained in its highest traditions and in all

that conduces to its truest progress. The eternal process moves on, and there can be no stagnation; and, I have no doubt that, in the future as in the past, the College will win fresh laurels and move on from achievement to achievement.

Brother alumni, I see an eventful and stirring age expanding before the rising generation. There is much to be achieved in the social and political spheres. Social evils that have been eating into the vitals of our society have to be banished. All infractions of love and equity in our social relations are speedily punished. You cannot do wrong without suffering wrong; but love and you shall be loved.

> ' Ring out false pride in place and blood
> The civic slander and the spite;
> Ring in the love of truth and right
> Ring in the common love of good.'

To the sufferers, let me say, 'Put God in your debt. Every stroke shall be repaid. The longer payment is withheld the better for you, for compound interest on compound interest is the rule and usage of this exchequer.'

In politics, there is a keen contest between new ideas and old forms; and whatsoever your differences of political opinion, I adjure you to hold fast to the vital principle of civilization, the union of liberty with order. The art to preserve this union has often baffled the wisest of statesmen and the best of leaders: and in the heat of the political conflict many have been led into the realms of anarchy. Carry into public affairs the same prudent considerations that command prosperity in private business. You enjoy already a large measure of political freedom; increase this if you will—but by solid investments, and not by hazardous speculations.

Ladies and Gentlemen I give you the 'Toast of the Madras Christian College.' Long may it live and progress, sending its light far and wide to battle against chaos and the dark, and to illumine the paths of generations yet unborn. I couple with the toast the name of the Rev. Dr. Macphail.

Dr. Macphail who responded to the toast said:

I have great pleasure in responding to the toast which you, sir, have so kindly proposed. This is not the first time that I have done so but I did not expect to have to do so to-night. Unfortunately Mr. Mackenzie who was to have responded to this toast is, owing to illness, prevented from being present with us. Mr. Mackenzie is one of our younger professors and it is only proper that old members of the staff should stand aside and that new professors should take an increasing share in functions connected with the College. And it is gratifying to know that the young men who have joined our staff—for though the College grows old it is perpetually renewing its youth—are entering fully into the traditions and life of the college. As I was listening to your speech, sir, some of your dates simply took my breath away, for I had not realized you had been so long connected with the College. It was thirty-seven years ago, in January 1886, that I taught the Junior F. A. Class for the first time in the Madras Christian College, and I am proud to say that our Chairman was then a distinguished student of that class.

I wish on this occasion to refer to only one or two points. The first is that we have a tradition. I trust that the high traditions associated with our College will continue and will be maintained. Within the College there is the tradition of friendliness, of brotherhood, not merely between the members of the staff, not merely between professors and students, but between student and student. While outside the walls of the College there is often much of race feeling and class hatred and hostility between man and man, within the College walls we find brotherliness and kindliness and mutual regard between the various classes, races and communities. No matter what political, racial or religious differences may divide them outside, once they enter the College, the teacher and the taught all feel they are united by the common bond of fellowship. The second point I wish to emphasize is the great ideals of the College. We are glad when our students distinguish themselves in University examinations and take their legitimate share in the public life of this Presidency. But what is far more important in our view than passing examinations is the development of character, and in this College we try to train the character of our pupils. It angers one to hear it suggested sometimes, as I heard it not long ago in the Legislative Council, that the Madras University does not care for the character of its students. It is forgotten by those who speak thus that the Madras University is made up of a number of Colleges and it is these Colleges, which form the Madras University, that are responsible for the development of the character of the students. We in this College at any rate try to take special pains to see that a student's character is trained and we endeavour to place before him what we regard as the highest ideals. I believe the Madras University works for the development of character through its colleges, and we in the Madras Christian College at all events consider that that is the most important aim of all. Discipline has to be enforced that character may develop, and though at times that may not be pleasant I believe that our students recognize that we have their highest welfare at heart.

You, sir, have made kind references to the work done by the members of the staff who are no longer connected with the College. While I was at home last year I saw several of them and talked to them. In July Dr. Miller had a serious illness, but when I saw him in August, I am glad to say, he was a little better. Dr. Miller's heart is still in Madras and he is keenly interested in everything about Madras. He likes very much to hear from his old students and though he may be unable to reply to all the letters received from them nothing gives him greater pleasure than to hear from his old boys. I saw Dr. Skinner in July and was glad to see him looking better than he has done for years. Dr. Pittendrigh has recovered from the neuritis from which he suffered for a time and is devoting himself to educational activities in Aberdeen. I saw Mr. George Patterson also, whom some of you will remember. His beard is now gray but otherwise he seems much the same as he was thirty-five years ago.

In conclusion I thank you, sir, for the extremely kind manner in which you have spoken of the College. I am very glad to see so many of the old boys attending this function. May I make two or three requests before sitting down. I hope all our old students will join the Christian College Day Association.

Next I should like to recommend to you the Old Boys Fund, a fund that has been started with the object of improving the salaries of the members of the Indian staff. Lastly there is the Cooper Fund for the benefit of poor students which we should like to see very much strengthened. May I appeal to Old Boys to subscribe liberally to these Funds?

In proposing the toast of 'Dr. Miller and Other Retired Professors' Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddy said that it was affection more than duty which prompted him to propose that toast. He had no doubt that the College exerted a powerful influence on the development of character, and the credit for that went to Dr. Miller and his associates. When he saw Dr. Miller last he found him as keen as ever. In the case of Dr. Miller age had only ripened his wisdom without in the least impairing his faculties, and his heart beat with as much enthusiasm as it ever did. They were in a special measure grateful to Dr. Miller for inaugurating a new ideal of an educational institution in South India which it would be their mission to develop. It might be said without exaggeration that Dr. Miller's life was the history of the College and the history of the College was bound up with the life of Dr. Miller. Dr. Miller encouraged self-government among the inmates of the various hostels and among the members of the Societies attached to the College. What struck him most was the way in which Dr. Miller impressed the universality of Shakespeare. Referring to Dr. Skinner Mr. Reddy said that it was not easy to speak of him. He resembled a sage and a saint, and he gave what was best in him for the College. Mr. Pittendrigh was a man of different type. He was of them and with them. In conclusion he prayed for the continued success and prosperity of the College and many more happy returns of the New Year. He reminded his brother Alumni of the debt of gratitude they owed to the Madras Christian College which was not merely a centre of learning but a centre of national influence in the Madras Presidency.

By way of reply to this toast Mr. T. N. Cunnooswamy read the following message from Dr. Miller:

To the Committee of the College Day Association.

GENTLEMEN,

Amid considerable suffering and excessive weakness I am still able to send a word of greeting to you and through you to old friends who may meet to celebrate this year's College Day. I suppose that this will find India almost entirely engrossed with its own special political action and speculation. It gives me no small satisfaction to be informed that our former students and many others throughout Southern India have shown that they regard the questions that have long been agitating the country with comparative moderation and sanity. May this be long and increasingly the case! I wish that it were possible for me to be among you or in any case to learn more than I know about the general state of feeling and the issues to which it may be tending, and possibly to give some little

help towards directing the thoughts of old friends along those lines of healthy, but not excessive, moderation which alone can secure the political and social welfare of your country throughout the generations that are to come.

The greatest of all needs, if there is to be any real security for this social and political welfare, is that there should be a steady growth of heartfelt co-operation and sympathetic mutual understanding between each and every one of the classes and races which at this critical conjuncture are called upon to work for the well-being of India in days to come, whether they are sons of the soil, ranging from what deems itself the highest to what others deem the lowest sections of the population, or whether they are dwellers in the land only for a season. I not only hope but trust that each one of you, and of those over whom you can exercise any influence, will take for central aim the earnest attempt to discourage every kind of jealousy between classes and to set up mutual understanding and sympathetic co-operation between them all as the one indispensable requirement of the present time.

After assuring you that my thoughts are as much as ever with you I think I cannot close this brief message better than by expressing the wish that everyone who desires the healthy political and social progress of your land would lay to heart what a well-known poet has said about the deepest cause of the failure of the greatest of ancient European Empires. The lines are these.

Like ours it look'd in outward air,
    Its head was clear and true,
Sumptuous its clothing, rich its fare,
    No pause its action knew.

Stout was its arm, each thew and bone
    Seem'd puissant and alive—
But, ah! its heart, its heart was stone,
    And so it could not thrive!

The lesson thus enshrined is one that must be learnt and to some adequate extent acted on by every social organism, whether large or small, that desires to prosper or even to endure. The larger the community is the need is always greater that theory on this point should be turned into practical reality. How great accordingly is this need in the cause of the huge population of India! That the heart of stone is as yet terribly prominent in the intercourse of men with men of the various strata of society with each other and of race with race, is only too well known to us all. The only hope resides in the gradual and steady, even if slow, change of this stony heartedness into such a heart as ought to regulate the feelings and guide the doings of a great community. Let us hope, that with the divine blessing on the example and efforts of men of good will in every section of the people, such a change of heart will become more and more constantly evident. Thus, and only thus can your great Motherland come to hold the place and to fulfil the ends in the story of mankind which it has always seemed to me that it is both meant and fitted to arrive at when the process of its development is complete.

Yours with all the old feelings of interest in the well-being of yourselves and of India,

WILLIAM MILLER.

November, 1922.

Mr. Subrahmanyam in proposing the toast of 'Our Young Friends' said that the young men of the College formed its main strength and its chief hope. He congratulated the young men on the privilege of growing up in the loving and bracing atmosphere of the College and he could not think of a better and more ennobling discipline than to sit within the walls of this great College and commit their lives and destinies to the keeping of a noble band of teachers. He had sometimes heard plaintive laments that the Christian College was changed in spirit, but he was happily in a position to allay such vague fears and repudiate those heresies about it. After paying a glowing tribute to the ability, devotion and selflessness of the members of the staff, Mr. Subrahmanyam said:—

'There is one aspect of instruction in this College which has often been a source of controversy and sometimes seems to threaten the loyalty of its sons. But I have no hesitation in emphasising the supreme value and abiding inspiration of Bible instruction in this College. I am speaking of my generation of twenty years ago. The Bible classes are a happy meeting ground of all branches of learning. It is with feelings of lively pride and satisfaction I revive memories of Scripture hours when the late Mr. Kellett introduced to the fourth class through sound channels the faint-hearted creed of Matthew Arnold, the rosy and robust optimism of Browning and the larger faith of Tennyson. The Bible blew the breath of life into literature, and literature redeemed Bible teaching. In this connection I take the risk of commending to your notice the transactions of the old Evangelistic Hall and the New College Church and the healing streams of life and hope that flow forth from the sermons of the Professors. The discovery, editing and publication of the sermons will be a legitimate and necessary task of the future. There in the church you are enabled to get glimpses of the full and complete personality of your professors. I owe not a little to the chastening and uplifting influence of the sermons in the Church where we find the Professor's heart warming and the face lighted up with a divine ardour, and it is no small privilege to have heard sermons from Dr. Miller, the late Mr. Mackenzie, Dr. Cooper, Mr. Kellett and Dr. Russell, Dr. Skinner, and last but not least Rev. Mr. Meston who has been aptly characterised as the 'prince of sermon writers.' You need not be alarmed that I am asking you straightaway to take up the Cross and deny yourself, but I fervently desire that you should not neglect this vital appendix to College life, of course, short of entering the fold.'

Mr. Subrahmanyam concluded by recalling some of the famous sayings of professors including one of Dr. Skinner's: 'There is nothing sacred that is not secular, and nothing secular that cannot be rendered sacred.'

This toast was responded to by Mr. Askar Ali of the fourth year Honours Class.

THE COLLEGE SPORTS were held this year on February 5. There were two new features. We used our new beach ground and we had the most valuable assistance of a number of our University Training Corps cadets in maintaining order. As a result instead of the pandemonium which took place during the tug-of-war feats last year when the unhappy tuggers could hardly breathe because of dust and noise, we had the spectators kept at a distance so that all could see. Our grateful thanks are due to these volunteers who after an arduous week-end in camp turned out for an extra fatigue. That is the spirit which we hear permeates the corps. Long may it be so!

The hundred yards race saw a very close finish with A. Eling first by about a foot and C. J. Ritchie and F. Jesudian practically equal for second.

In putting the shot Narasinga Rao was an easy first and those who watched know why. We expect him to win the inter-collegiate event since Coombes of the Medical College who equals him in weight is no longer eligible, we hear.

The sack fight produced a great deal of amusement and was well contested especially the final duel between Ritchie and Krishnaswami and the latter by subtlety and by lying low won. The art of success lies in ju-jitsu, in using your opponent's force against himself.

In the high jump three competitors survived. N. Koshi, Matthews and Paulson. In one of his jumps Koshi was unfortunate enough to land on the edge of the pit and strained his ankle muscles and this left the others to fight it out. They both cleared four feet eleven inches but failed at five feet and were declared equal. Their display was a very interesting study in psychology, and in method.

The quarter mile was well run and A. Eling came first with Jesudian second and H. B. Phillips a good third.

The long jump was rather disappointing—A. Eling was first with 16′ 10½′ and Paulson second with 16′ 8″, but they should not be satisfied with such a result. The others were even less creditable. Want of practice as usual!

In the one mile P. R. Kuppuswami who won last year retained his honour, and was an easy winner, but A. Eling ran extremely well and came second after a strenuous afternoon.

The relay race was very exciting. Class four was given a good lead by Ritchie, but T. B. I. Mathew overtook his man and gave the lead to Class two who finally won with Jesudian first.

The tug-of-war produced one good tussle between Class three and Class four (group 4). For a time it looked as if last year's winners were to be defeated. In the finals we had a repetition of last year—Class four (Group 5) though pulling manfully were not heavy enough and Class four (Group 4) retained their honour.

The fancy dress competition was a new item and several extremely good costumes appeared. S. Ramaswami as a Brahmin holy man was first and S. Rajan as a rickshaw cooly second; P. S. Shama Rao also distinguished himself as a long-bearded holy man and V. Krishnaswami as a waiter. One of the boys as a postal peon was so natural that one of the Professors was quite taken in by the telegram and pondered for long before he realised the joke.

jealous mistress, and. the practice of law claimed his attention to the exclusion of public activities. · His grasp of law and his skilled advocacy won him the respect of the Bench and of the profession. We offer our hearty congratulation to Mr. Madhavan Nair and to Mr. Anantakrishna Aiyer.

A DIFFERENT KIND OF HONOUR has fallen on another alumnus of the College—Mr. O. Thanicachellum Chetty, who has been one of the recipients of the New Year Honours. Rao Bahadur O. Thanicachellum Chetty graduated from the College in 1896 and soon after joined the office of Mr. James Short, Solicitor. Mr. Thanicachellum's remarkable capacity for work and single minded devotion won the esteem and confidence of Mr. Short, who devolved on him the whole work of the office which became enlarged in course of time into the legal firm of Short and Bewes. Mr. Thanicachellum made good use of the opportunity and made himself proficient in every branch of legal work before he graduated as a Bachelor of Law. He could now enrol himself as a Vakil and set up independent practice, but choosing to proceed as he had begun, he articled himself as an apprentice to Mr. Short whom he had served so long and was soon enlisted as a solicitor of the Madras High Court and taken as a partner in the firm of Short, Bewes & Co. Mr. Short is dead but the training he had given to his trusted adjutant is seen in the thoroughness and zeal with which Mr. Thanicachellum Chetty places the case of not only his clients but of the public. It was not till a few years ago that he made his appearance as a public man. Returned to the Madras Corporation in 1918 where he soon made his mark as an effective cleanser of the Augean stables, he became the rising hope of the stern and unbending non-Brahmins under the leadership of Sir P. Theagaraya Chetty. In 1919 he was returned by the non-Mahomedan electorate of the Madras City as one of their representatives in the Madras Legislative Council where he has since played a conspicuous part as a champion of the non-Brahmin Hindus.

IT IS WITH DEEP REGRET that we record the death from pneumonia of Capt. C. C. Ittycheria, B. A., M. B., B. S., I.M.S. which took place on February 6, at Pannu in the North West Frontier Province. Mr. Ittycheria graduated from this College in 1912 and soon after joined the Medical College. On the outbreak of the Great War he volunteered his services and was placed on duty in the hospital ship *Madras*. After a few months service on the *Madras* Mr. Ittycheria returned to the Medical College to complete his studies and headed the list of those who took the M. B., B. S. degree in 1917. He was immediately given a temporary commission in the Indian Medical Service, and as Lieut. Ittycheria was posted to Bushire and latter to Basra and Baghdad. On the conclusion of peace he was transferred to the North West Frontier Province of India. Lieut. Ittycheria's record of distinguished service led the authorities to make his commission permanent in 1921. Both as a student in the College and as resident of the Fenn Hostel, Mr. Ittycheria was noted for his studious habits, his amiable disposition and straight-forwardness of character. Capt. Ittycheria belonged to a respectable family of Kottayam and about 1911 he married a daughter of the late Mr. P. T. Thariyan, I. S. O., of the Madras Secretariat and the first Manager of

the Fenn Hostel. He died at the age of 31, leaving behind a young wife, a child, his parents, and a large circle of friends to mourn his early death. We would convey our sincere condolences to the bereaved family.

THE MAGAZINE EXTENDS ITS CONGRATULATIONS to F. W. Henderson, Esq., M.A., headmaster of the school, on his marriage to Miss Alice Sergeant, M.A., I.E.S., Acting Principal of Queen Mary's College. The marriage took place on March 10th, in St. Mary's Church, Fort St. George, the Rev. C. E. Sell being the officiating clergyman with the Rev. A. G. Hogg assisting.

C. L. S. PRESS, MADRAS—1923